

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

23 October 2020

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Estevan-Reina, L. and de Lemus, S. and Megías, J.L. and Kutlaca, M. and Belmonte-García, M. and Becker, J. (2021) 'Allies against sexism: the impact of men's egalitarian versus paternalistic confrontation on women's empowerment and well-being.', *Sex roles.*, 84 . pp. 536-553.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01184-4>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of a journal article published in *Sex roles*. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01184-4>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

this work received financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation; DFG BE 4648/4-2).

Data and Materials Availability: Preregistration of Studies 2 and 3 as well as supplementary materials of Studies 1–3, the data sets generated for pooled analyses of Studies 1–3 and an English translation of the main measures used in the three studies can be found in the <https://osf.io/uh27n/>. The raw data supporting the conclusions of Studies 1–3 and the original version of measures used in Studies 1–3 will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation, to any qualified researcher.

Abstract

Men as advantaged group members can be involved in actions against inequality. But how do women experience men's confrontation of sexism? We examine how women perceive men's egalitarian versus paternalistic confrontation of sexism. We hypothesized that women would be more likely to report empowerment and well-being (i.e., more happiness and less anger) after egalitarian confrontation than after paternalistic confrontation, which should increase their future intention to confront sexism. Using hypothetical scenarios, the results of three studies conducted in Spain, Germany, and Mexico confirmed our hypotheses. They also highlighted that empowerment (but not happiness) triggered by egalitarian confrontation, as well as anger triggered by paternalistic confrontation, lead women to express greater future intention to confront sexism. Our findings suggest that male confronters motivated by egalitarian reasons are more likely perceived as allies of women because they not only make women feel better but also empower them to keep fighting. Further, women may react against men motivated by paternalistic reasons (especially if they are strongly identified as feminist or endorse low benevolent sexist beliefs). Implications for activists, policymakers, and practitioners who are interested in involving men in fighting gender inequality are discussed.

Keywords: men as allies; sexism confrontation; egalitarian motivation; paternalistic motivation; empowerment; anger; feminist identification; benevolent sexism

Allies Against Sexism: The Impact of Men's Egalitarian versus Paternalistic Confrontation on Women's Empowerment and Well-Being

You're a woman partying with your girlfriends. A stranger starts flirting with you in an insistent and annoying way. Another man witnessing the scene decides to confront him and says: "Don't be such a male chauvinist! Men should respect women and fight against inequality." A third guy also gets involved and says, "Hey! Stop being rude! Men should treat women more delicately."

How would you feel? Would you feel happy and grateful to those who intervened or annoyed because they assumed that you needed their protection? Both men confronted the perpetrator, but in a different manner: The first confronter labeled the perpetrator's behavior as sexist whereas the second confronter failed to do so. From a social identity approach (Tajfel and Turner 1979; Turner et al. 1987), we assume that confrontation enacted by an advantaged group member can be considered as a form of intergroup behavior. The present paper contributes to the growing literature on allyship by examining the consequences of actions by advantaged group members against inequality on targets of discrimination. Specifically, we test the effects of two forms of confrontation against sexist behavior by advantaged group members (i.e., egalitarian vs. paternalistic) on women's empowerment, well-being, and future intention to confront sexism.

Allies Against Sexism

Individual actions against inequality, such as confrontation, contribute to social change because they can reduce future sexist behaviors (Mallett and Wagner 2011), and they are associated with more competence, self-esteem, and empowerment among women (Gervais et al. 2010; Hyers 2007). However, explicit and public confrontation of sexism by women is infrequent (Hyers 2007; Mallett and Melchiori 2014; Swim and Hyers 1999), and those who

confront risk being disliked by advantaged and disadvantaged group members (Dodd et al. 2002; Eliezer and Major 2012). In fact, many women consider confrontation unhelpful and aversive (Czopp and Monteith 2003).

Some studies suggest that men may be more effective than women in confronting sexist behavior because their actions are taken more seriously and they are less likely to experience social costs (Drury and Kaiser 2014; see also Kutlaca et al. 2019). Moreover, men's acknowledgement of sexism may also empower women. For instance, women increased their self-confidence, showed less stereotype confirmation, and were more likely to file a complaint against a perpetrator when the discriminatory experience was confirmed by a male rather than by a female colleague (Cihangir et al. 2014). However, male confrontation of sexism may also have potential costs for women. Advantaged group member's actions can contribute to normalizing power relations between groups (Hasan-Aslih, Pliskin, Shuman, van Zomeren, Saguy, & Halperin, (in press) and reinforce inequality by fostering the disadvantaged group member's dependence on the advantaged group.

According to the model of intergroup helping as a status relation (Nadler 2002), there are two types of outgroup helping: dependency-oriented help (which perpetuates social hierarchies) and autonomy-oriented help (which challenges them). Autonomy-oriented help implies providing the tools for the disadvantaged group members to resolve their problems by themselves. Similarly, intergroup contact literature has highlighted that positive contact may undermine collective action by the disadvantaged group (Saguy et al. 2009; Wright and Lubensky 2008). In contrast, when advantaged group members explicitly recognize inequality as illegitimate, it does not reduce the disadvantaged groups' support for social change (Becker et al. 2013). In fact, in opposition to positive contact, supportive contact (a specific positive intergroup

contact characterized by recognizing inequality as illegitimate and by opposition to it) may increase engagement in collective action by the disadvantaged group (Droogendyk, Louis et al. 2016). Thus, autonomy-oriented help and supportive contact might represent two forms in which advantaged group members can be allies for social change (Droogendyk, Wright et al. 2016; Radke et al. 2020).

However, to understand whether advantaged group members' actions contribute to social change or perpetuate social hierarchies, we must consider their underlying motivations (Broido 2000; Edwards 2006; Estevan-Reina et al. 2020; Louis et al. 2019; Radke et al. 2020). We propose that confrontation might have a different impact on women depending on the motivations underlying advantaged group members' actions, or the way targets perceive these motivations. Specifically, we distinguish between two types of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic), depending on whether they aim to promote social change or perpetuate the status quo.

Egalitarian or Paternalistic Confrontation

Egalitarian or paternalistic reasons might motivate advantaged group members' actions (Estevan-Reina et al. 2020). Egalitarian motives are linked to feminist identity—a form of politicized collective identity aimed at ending gender inequality (Simon and Klandermans 2001). In contrast, paternalism and sexism reinforce power asymmetries in intergroup relations (Glick and Fiske 1996; Jackman 1994). Specifically, literature has highlighted the pernicious effect of benevolent sexism in perpetuating gender inequality (Barreto and Ellemers 2005; Becker and Wright 2011; Jost and Kay 2005). One of the core aspects of benevolent sexism is the belief that men have a duty to protect women (i.e., protective paternalism: Glick and Fiske 1996), and it promotes dependency-oriented help (Shnabel et al. 2016). Importantly, the duty to protect

women predicts the frequency of confronting sexism on behalf of socially close women, but not on behalf of distant ones (Good et al. 2018).

Estevan-Reina et al. (2020) found two distinct paths explaining men's intention to confront sexism: a feminist path and a paternalistic one. Men's endorsement of feminist identification led them to confront sexism through egalitarian motivation, whereas benevolent sexism leads men to confront sexism through paternalistic motivation. Moreover, only the feminist path leads men to express greater collective action intentions and actual engagement in social movements designed to question male societal privileges. Consistently, Radke, Hornsey, and Barlow (2018) found that benevolent sexism in men (but not in women) was positively related to protective actions (e.g. behavior designed to guard women against male violence), but not to feminist collective actions (i.e., behaviors that challenge gender inequality). In contrast, feminist identification predicted willingness to engage in feminist actions for both genders.

Still, little is known about the consequences of men's sexism confrontation on women's empowerment and well-being (i.e., happiness and anger). We define *egalitarian confrontation* as a behavior triggered by beliefs about gender equality that push men to act against discriminatory situations; *paternalistic confrontation*, as a behavior triggered by beliefs about the duty to protect women that push men to act against discriminatory situations. Moreover, women's reactions to male confrontation might be contingent on the extent to which women endorse feminist identification or benevolent attitudes. Finally, we examined whether egalitarian and paternalistic confrontation might motivate women to confront sexism.

Women's Empowerment and Well-Being

Empowerment is a multifaceted concept that includes personal, relational and societal dimensions (Huis et al. 2017). From a feminist perspective, empowerment can be understood as

“power-to,” which is close to the concept of self-efficacy (Bandura 1995), in opposition to “power-over” (Yoder and Kahn 1992). According to Zimmerman (1995), empowerment is at the same time both an outcome and a process. In this line, being empowered is a state in which one’s goals can be fulfilled (Pratto 2016). Previous literature has shown that confrontation is positively associated with competence, self-esteem, and empowerment among women (Gervais et al. 2010). We propose that men’s confrontation of sexism might also empower women. Some indirect evidence for this argument has been provided by previous literature (Cihangir et al. 2014; Droogendyk, Louis et al. 2016). Egalitarian confrontation can be seen as a form of supportive contact (Droogendyk, Wright et al. 2016) that may empower women because confrontation signals that one is supportive of social change. Thus, we hypothesize that egalitarian confrontation will empower women more than paternalistic confrontation (Hypothesis 1).

Furthermore, we expect egalitarian confrontation to have positive effects on women’s well-being (i.e., increased happiness—Hypothesis 2; decreased anger—Hypothesis 3) compared to paternalistic confrontation. Subjective well-being has been positively associated with pleasant and positive emotions (popularly referred to as “happiness”) and negatively associated with unpleasant and negative emotions (Diener et al. 2018). Disadvantaged group members who do not perceive the hierarchy as legitimate or stable might reject dependency-oriented help, such as paternalistic confrontation, and only accept autonomy-oriented help, which underlies more egalitarian relationships (Nadler 2002). In other words, if women perceive men’s confrontation as a form of sexist behavior because it is motivated by paternalistic beliefs, they might feel negatively about it and thus experience decreased empowerment and well-being. This effect should be most pronounced for women who identify as feminists and reject benevolently sexist

beliefs. Recent research has shown that women strongly identified as feminist perceive a feminist man who offers autonomy-oriented help as a better ally than a man who offers dependency-oriented help (Wiley and Dunne 2019).

Empowerment, Anger, and Women's Intention to Confront

We also investigate the roles empowerment, happiness, and anger play in motivating women to engage in social change. Intergroup conflict literature has pointed out the role of subjective power (labeled “efficacy”; Drury et al. 2015, p. 95) in motivating social change (Hornsey et al. 2006; van Zomeren et al. 2012; van Zomeren et al. 2008 van Zomeren et al. 2004). Thus, the expected positive effects of egalitarian confrontation on empowerment may enhance women's future intention to confront. This linkage is consistent with the positive effect of efficacy on collective action (Social Identity Model of Collective Action: SIMCA; van Zomeren et al. 2008) and the needs-based model of reconciliation (Shnabel et al. 2009). According to the latter model extended to intergroup contexts, when advantaged group members restore disadvantaged group members' sense of agency through their empowerment, this prevents passive acceptance of inequality and increases disadvantaged group members' readiness to act for change (Shnabel and Nadler 2015). In fact, the perception of #MeToo movement as empowering for women is positively associated with their campaign support (Kende, et al. 2020). In contrast, the role of positive emotions in promoting social change has been questioned. Self-directed positive emotions do not play an important role in predicting collective actions (Becker et al. 2011), and hope for harmony in intergroup conflicts is negatively associated with the disadvantaged group members' motivation for collective action (among the low identifiers; Hasan-Aslih, et al. 2019). Thus, we hypothesize that the empowerment (but not happiness) experienced after egalitarian confrontation will predict women's future intention to confront

(Hypothesis 4).

Anger triggered by perceived injustice also motivates participation in social change actions (Iyer et al. 2007; van Zomeren et al. 2008). In our work, however, we focused on the role of anger triggered by men's paternalistic confrontation. We argue that confrontation based on paternalistic arguments might trigger more opposition than egalitarian confrontation because paternalism maintains the status quo and reinforces social hierarchies (Becker and Wright 2011; Jost and Kay 2005). Recent literature has shown that even subtle discrimination cues can trigger resistance responses in women, which include reporting more anger (de Lemus et al. 2018). Thus, we hypothesize that paternalistic confrontation might trigger anger in women as a form of resistance against a sexist man, which might increase their future intention to confront (Hypothesis 5).

The Current Studies

Based on the social identity approach (Tajfel and Turner 1979; Turner et al. 1987) and extending previous research that has proposed the distinction between autonomy-oriented and dependency-oriented help (Nadler 2002), as well as cross-group positive and supportive contact (Droogendyck, Louis et al. 2016), we examine the impact of egalitarian and paternalistic confrontation of sexism by men. Specifically, the aim of our research is to examine the effects of men's confrontation on women's empowerment, well-being, and future intention to confront sexism (Studies 1, 2, and 3). We hypothesize that egalitarian confrontation will lead to more empowerment and happiness but less anger among women than paternalistic confrontation. We also expect that the empowerment (but not happiness) triggered by egalitarian confrontation, as well as anger triggered by paternalistic confrontation, will predict women's future intention to confront.

In Studies 2 and 3, we included a target-confrontation condition, in which the woman confronts sexism herself, in order to be able to compare the effects of target versus advantaged group member's confrontation on women's empowerment and well-being. We also wanted to analyze whether these processes were consistent across different cultural contexts. For this reason, we conducted our studies in the following countries: Spain (Study 1), Germany (Study 2: a preregistered study), and Mexico (Study 3: a preregistered study). According to the Gender Inequality Index of the United Nations Development Programme (2017), Germany and Spain have similar levels of gender inequality, and both countries have a lower level of gender inequality than Mexico. In less egalitarian countries, women endorse more benevolent sexist beliefs (Glick et al. 2000); thus, paternalism might be more accepted in Mexico than in Spain and Germany. Finally, we conducted an integrative data analysis by pooling the three datasets into one (Curran and Hussong 2009), which allowed us not only to test the differences among countries but also to check the main results of Studies 1–3 with more statistical power and sample heterogeneity. A larger sample size also allowed us to explore feminist identification and benevolent sexism as possible moderators. All data collections were reviewed and approved by university Institutional Review Boards.

Pilot Study

We recruited 60 participants to take part in our pilot study on the campuses of a Spanish university ($n = 30$) and a German university ($n = 30$) in exchange for a chocolate bar. Half the participants in each country were randomly assigned to read the egalitarian confrontation scenario and the other half read the paternalistic one. They then completed 14 items that included questions about the confronter. Four items measured the extent to which they perceived the confronter as paternalistic (e.g., “he is protecting women”; after excluding one of them with a

total-item correlation under .10, $\alpha = .77$); three items measured the extent to which they perceived the confronter as sexist (e.g., “he is macho”; $\alpha = .80$); and the other seven items measured the extent to which they perceived the confronter as egalitarian (e.g., “he is fighting against gender inequality”; $\alpha = .91$). The participants rated their opinions from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*).

We conducted a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) on perceptions of the confronter with type of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) and country (Spain vs. Germany) as between-subject factors. That analysis revealed that the manipulation had a significant multivariate effect, Wilks’s $\Lambda = .700$, $F(3, 54) = 22.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .300$. As expected, women perceived the egalitarian confronter as more egalitarian ($M = 4.55$, $SE = .26$) than the paternalistic confronter ($M = 3.10$, $SE = .26$), $F(1, 56) = 15.11$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .213$. In contrast, they perceived the paternalistic confronter as more sexist ($M = 4.02$, $SE = .33$) than the egalitarian confronter ($M = 2.82$, $SE = .33$), $F(1, 56) = 6.70$, $p = .012$, $\eta_p^2 = .107$. Women perceived the paternalistic ($M = 4.49$, $SE = .31$) and the egalitarian ($M = 4.3$, $SE = .31$) confronters as similarly paternalistic, $F(1, 56) = .18$, $p < .673$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$. Neither a univariate main effect of country ($F < .60$, $p = .441$) nor an interaction between the type of confrontation and country ($F < .98$, $p = .327$) was found. Despite this similar perception in terms of paternalism, the man who confronted in a blatantly paternalistic way was perceived as more sexist than the egalitarian one. These ratings provide empirical support that the paternalistic confrontation is qualitatively different from the condition in which the man expresses egalitarian reasons to confront (although this can still be perceived as paternalistic from the perspective of women to the extent that it implies acting on their behalf). From the perspective of the advantaged group’s motivations to confront, we label the two conditions as egalitarian and

paternalistic. However, women's perceptions of the two confronters may differ depending on their interpretation of men's motivations and actions. We will address this point in the general discussion.

Study 1

We tested whether imagined men's egalitarian or paternalistic confrontation had different consequences for women. We hypothesized that after men's egalitarian confrontation, women would be more likely to feel empowered (Hypothesis 1) and experience more happiness (Hypothesis 2) and less anger (Hypothesis 3) than after men's paternalistic confrontation. Furthermore, we analyzed the implications of empowerment, happiness, and anger for women's future intention to confront.

Method

Participants. A total of 200 Spanish women took part in the study. One participant was excluded because she did not finish the questionnaire. The final sample consisted of 199 women. The participants' ages ranged from 18 to 33 years-old, with a mean age of 22.03 years ($SD = 2.73$, $Mdn = 21$). Of the total number of participants 193 (97%) were students from a university in the south of Spain and 192 (97.5%) were Spanish citizens. We conducted a sensitivity analysis using G*power (Faul et al. 2007) to determine the effect size that the current study could detect. The results showed that with this sample size ($n = 199$) and with $\alpha = 0.5$ and $1 - \beta$ (power) = .80, the minimum effect size that we could detect for an ANOVA unifactorial analysis was $f = 0.20$, and the minimum effect size we could detect for a multiple regression with two predictors was $f^2 = 0.05$.

Procedure and measures. We approached students at the university library to encourage them to take part in a 15-minute paper-and-pencil survey. We first recorded participants' ages,

nationality, and occupation. The rest of the measures are described here in the same order as they appeared in the survey unless otherwise specified. At the end, participants were debriefed and rewarded with chocolate bars to thank them for their contributions.

Men's confrontation manipulation. All participants saw a hypothetical scenario presented in the style of a comic that represented a social interaction in which a man makes a sexist comment to a woman. We asked participants to imagine that they were the targets of the sexist comment. The first picture depicted a woman asking two men on the street for a lighter. The second picture depicted the perpetrator saying: "Of course, I'll lend it to you, gorgeous. But only if in return you'll come to sleep with me tonight, because I don't want to sleep alone." A third picture included the confrontation manipulation depending on the experimental condition. In the egalitarian condition, the male bystander says, "Hey! What's up? That comment is sexist. I don't think that it's fair to treat women like that. Men should fight against gender inequality." In the paternalistic condition, a male bystander confronts the sexist comment by saying, "Hey! What's up? That comment is rude. I don't think that it's appropriate to treat women like that. Men should take care of and protect women." The comics are provided in the online supplement.

Empowerment. We measured empowerment with eight items adapted from Moya-Garófano et al. (2018), namely "powerful," "full of energy," "stimulated," "empowered," "without control of the situation," "weak," "inferior," and "defenseless." We assessed participants' happiness and anger, asking them how they would feel after hearing the confronter's comment. Responses were recorded on a scale ranging from 0 (*nothing*) to 10 (*very much*). Scores on the items designed to measure low empowerment were reversed, and a total score was calculated, with higher scores indicating greater empowerment ($\alpha = .83$).

Emotions. We used the Escala de Valoración del Estado de Ánimo (EVEA) (Scale for

Mood Assessment; Sanz 2001), which measures the following emotions: happiness (happy, optimistic, joyful, and cheerful), hostility (irritated, angry, annoyed, and displeased), sadness, and anxiety (more information can be found in the online supplement.) Additionally, based on literature that highlights the role of anger in promoting collective actions (van Zomeren et al. 2004; van Zomeren et al. 2012), we decided to include five anger-related items (“with rage,” “outraged,” “insulted,” “offended,” and “humiliated”). It is important to note that these adjectives measure emotions toward the confronter’s rather than the perpetrator’s comment, which is why we evaluated interpersonal rather than intergroup anger. We also included four items measuring the feeling of gratitude (“respected,” “comfortable,” “relaxed,” and “grateful”). Responses were recorded on a scale ranging from 0 (*nothing*) to 10 (*very much*). We conducted a principal components analysis with varimax rotation (factor loadings can be found in the online supplement.) It extracted four factors with eigenvalues higher than 1 that explained 68.84% of the variance. Anger items were loaded together with the EVEA hostility items, whereas the gratitude items were loaded on the happiness factor. Therefore, all these items were averaged across two dimensions (anger, 9 items: $\alpha = .96$; happiness, 8 items: $\alpha = .90$).

Confrontation intentions. We asked the participants how they would behave if they experienced a similar sexist situation. We selected two items (“I would tell him that he has no right to treat women like this” and “I would let him know that I don’t think it’s right to have this kind of attitude toward women”) from a broader set of items used in previous studies (Estevan-Reina et al. 2020). The Pearson correlation between both items was adequate ($r = .74$). We included additional items to assess aggressive confrontation, denigratory confrontation, and avoidance responses (more information about these items can be found in the online supplement.)

Manipulation check. We used the same items as in the pilot study to measure to what extent the confronter was perceived by women as egalitarian (8 items, $\alpha = .93$) and paternalistic (3 items, $\alpha = .83$). Evaluations of both the perpetrator's and the confronter's comments were measured with two items ("To what extent do you consider the comment of the [white/black shirt] guy to be sexist?" and "To what extent do you consider the comment of the [white/black shirt] guy to be very negative/very positive?"). The format of responses was from -3 to $+3$.

In addition, participants rated their political orientation, endorsement of benevolent sexism, feminist identification, postural measure of submission or dominance, self-description as agentic or communal, and awareness of gender inequality (these additional measures are described in detail in the online supplement.)

Results

Manipulation check. We conducted a MANOVA, including the type of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) as the independent variable and perceptions of the confronter as egalitarian or paternalistic as dependent variables, revealing a significant multivariate effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .518$, $F(2, 196) = 91.27$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .482$. A significant univariate effect of the type of confrontation emerged on perceived egalitarianism, $F(1, 197) = 141.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .418$. Women perceived the confronter in the egalitarian condition ($M = 5.03$, $SD = 1.35$) as more egalitarian than the confronter in the paternalistic condition ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.41$). There was no significant effect on perceptions of paternalism, $F(1, 197) = .96$, $p = .329$, $\eta_p^2 = .005$.

We conducted a second MANOVA, including the type of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) as the independent variable and women's perceptions of the perpetrator's and confronter's comments as dependent variables, uncovering a significant multivariate effect. Wilks's $\Lambda = .682$, $F(4, 192) = 22.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .318$. As we expected, univariate analyses

showed no significant differences in how women evaluated the perpetrator's comment (perceived sexism: $F(1, 195) = .02, p = .89, \eta_p^2 < .001$; negative/positive valence: $F(1, 195) = .34, p = .56, \eta_p^2 = .002$) but significant differences in how they perceived the confronter's comment (perceived sexism: $F(1, 195) = 81.96, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .296$; negative/positive valence: $F(1, 195) = 63.87, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .247$). Specifically, women perceived the paternalistic confronter as more sexist ($M = 1.15, SE = .18$) and negative ($M = .26, SE = .18$) than the egalitarian confronter ($M = -1.23, SE = .19$ and $M = 1.80, SE = .18$, respectively).

Women's empowerment and well-being. To test Hypotheses 1 through 3, we conducted a univariate MANOVA, including the type of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) as the independent variable. The empowerment and the two emotions representing well-being (anger and happiness) were dependent variables, finding a significant multivariate effect of the type of confrontation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .844, F(3, 195) = 11.98, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .156$. As predicted, the type of confrontation had a significant effect on empowerment, $F(1, 197) = 12.52, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .060$; happiness, $F(1, 197) = 29.50, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .130$; and anger, $F(1, 197) = 31.91, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .139$. The results showed that women reported more empowerment and happiness as well as less anger after the imagined male egalitarian confrontation than after the male paternalistic confrontation (see Table 1a). Thus, Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were supported.

Table 1

Main Effects of Type of Confrontation on Women's Empowerment, Well-Being, and Future Intention to Confront by Country

Type of confrontation	<i>n</i>	Empowerment <i>M (SE)</i>	Happiness <i>M (SE)</i>	Anger <i>M (SE)</i>	Confrontation <i>M (SE)</i>
(a) Study 1 (Spain) <i>n</i> = 198					
Male egalitarian confrontation	97	5.68 _a (.19)	4.96 _a (.21)	3.67 _a (.25)	5.68 _a (.20)
Male paternalistic confrontation	101	4.72 _b (.18)	3.22 _b (.20)	5.84 _b (.25)	5.61 _a (.19)
(b) Study 2 (Germany) <i>n</i> = 223					
Male egalitarian confrontation	76	5.46 _a (.21)	4.53 _a (.23)	3.82 _a (.28)	5.47 _a (.22)
Male paternalistic confrontation	69	4.18 _b (.22)	3.50 _b (.25)	5.43 _b (.30)	6.42 _b (.23)
Target confrontation	78	6.01 _c (.21)	1.38 _c (.23)	6.99 _c (.28)	6.29 _{ab} (.22)
(c) Study 3 (Mexico) <i>n</i> = 170					
Male egalitarian confrontation	55	5.67 _a (.25)	5.28 _a (.27)	2.72 _a (.33)	5.64 _a (.26)
Male paternalistic confrontation	58	4.41 _b (.24)	3.78 _b (.27)	4.52 _b (.32)	5.87 _a (.25)
Target confrontation	57	5.44 _a (.24)	1.49 _c (.27)	8.15 _c (.33)	5.71 _a (.26)
(d) Pooled analyses (Studies 1, 2 & 3) <i>n</i> = 456					
Male egalitarian confrontation	228	5.61 _a (.13)	4.92 _a (.15)	3.40 _a (.18)	5.60 _a (.13)
Male paternalistic confrontation	228	4.44 _b (.13)	3.50 _b (.15)	5.26 _b (.18)	5.96 _a (.13)

Note. Different letter subscripts in a column within each panel denote significant differences in post hoc (Sidak) analyses at $p < .05$. All discrepancies between sample sizes in the participants' section and in the table are due to missing values.

Women's future intention to confront via empowerment and anger. To test whether the empowerment and anger that women experienced after being exposed to a hypothetical scenario of confrontation would lead them to express greater future intention to confront sexism (Hypotheses 4 and 5), as well as to explore the role of happiness in predicting future confrontation intentions, we conducted a multiple mediation model with the macro PROCESS (Hayes 2013), using 5,000 bootstrap samples to estimate bias-corrected standard errors and 95% confidence intervals. We performed a parallel mediational model (Model 4 in PROCESS) that included empowerment, happiness, and anger as mediators (see Figure 1). The total effect of type of confrontation on women's future intention to confront sexism was not significant ($b = .07$, 95% CI [-.39, .54], $p = .739$). Means and standard errors are shown in Table 1a. The indirect

effects of type of confrontation through empowerment ($b = .22$, 95% CI [.07, .46]) and anger ($b = -.30$, 95% CI [-.63, -.07]) were significant, but not the indirect effect through happiness ($b = .02$, 95% CI [-.23, .29]). The direct effect remained nonsignificant when the mediators were included in the model ($b = .13$, 95% CI [-.36, .62], $p = .550$). In line with Hypotheses 4 and 5, these results showed that higher levels of empowerment and anger (but not of happiness) predicted higher intention to confront sexism.




Figure 1. Parallel mediation model for the relationship between type of confrontation and women's future intentions to confront. *B*s are reported. Dashed line indicates a nonsignificant pathway. S1=Study 1 (Spain); S2= Study 2 (Germany); S3= Study 3 (Mexico); P= pooled analyses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Discussion

Study 1 supports the idea that women react more positively after witnessing an egalitarian confronter than a paternalistic confronter. First, men's egalitarian confrontation made women report feeling more empowered and happy. Second, the results indicate that increased empowerment (but not happiness) motivates women to express greater intention to act against sexism in the future. Additionally, we found that women reported experiencing more anger after paternalistic rather than after egalitarian confrontation. This effect may be due to male egalitarian confrontation reducing women's anger (increasing their well-being), as well as to negative reactions of female participants to the paternalistic confrontation. Consistent with previous literature about the role of anger in predicting action, the results suggest that increases in anger lead women to express greater future intention to confront sexism.

Although in Study 1 and in the pilot study the man who confronts in an egalitarian way was perceived by women as more egalitarian and less sexist than the paternalistic confronter, both were perceived as paternalistic to the same extent. These results suggest that when a man confronts sexism on a woman's behalf, even if he is guided by egalitarian attitudes, he may still be perceived as paternalistic because he is not allowing the woman to act by herself. Therefore, it is important to compare male egalitarian confrontation with a situation confronted by a female target of sexism, which to our knowledge has not been done before. We incorporated target confrontation in Studies 2 and 3. In the months prior to data collection, massive demonstrations took place demanding gender equality in Spain (Gómez 2019; Grodiera et al. 2018). Therefore, to be able to generalize our findings beyond the Spanish context, we decided to run two new studies in different cultural contexts (Germany and Mexico).

Studies 2 and 3

In these two studies we included a new experimental condition (target confrontation). As in Study 1, we hypothesized that women would be more likely to feel empowered (Hypothesis 1a) and experience more well-being (more happiness—Hypothesis 2a; less anger—Hypothesis 3a) after a male egalitarian confrontation than after a male paternalistic one. We further hypothesized that women would feel more empowered after imagining themselves as confronters (target confrontation) than after a male egalitarian (Hypothesis 1b) or paternalistic confrontation (Hypothesis 1c) because confrontation by women is positively associated with their sense of competence, self-esteem, and empowerment (Gervais et al. 2010; Hyers 2007). Because previous literature has documented that confrontation includes important emotional costs for women (Czopp and Monteith 2003; Dodd et al. 2002; Eliezer and Major 2012; Gervais and Hillard 2014), we also hypothesized that women would experience less well-being after imagining themselves confronting (target confrontation) than after male egalitarian and paternalistic confrontation. Thus, after target confrontation, women would feel less happiness (Hypothesis 2b) and more anger than after male egalitarian (Hypothesis 3b) or paternalistic confrontation (happiness—Hypothesis 2c; anger—Hypothesis 3c). However, it is important to note that the emotions experienced by women after imagining their own confrontation in contrast to a male confrontation reflect different processes. Emotions that women experience after male confrontation may reflect agreement or disagreement with the male confronter, whereas emotions experienced after taking the perspective of a disadvantaged group member's confrontation may project facing a threatening situation by themselves.

In relation to the indirect effects of male confrontation on women's future intention to confront sexism, we expected to replicate the results found in Study 1 regarding men's types of

confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) on women's future intention to confront sexism via empowerment (Hypothesis 4) and anger (Hypothesis 5). Although in Study 1 this indirect effect through happiness was not significant, we explored it again in Studies 2 and 3 in different cultural contexts.

Method

Participants. In Study 2, 315 German women started the online survey. However, 79 were excluded because they did not finish it, eight because they did not answer the manipulation check correctly, three because they self-identified as men, and two because the time they spent answering the survey exceeded the total average time by more than two standard deviations. The final sample comprised 223 women. Participants' ages ranged between 17 and 45 years-old, with a mean age of 23.59 years ($SD = 4.30$, $Mdn = 23$). Of the total number of participants, 218 (97.3%) were students from a northern university in Germany, and 217 (97.3%) were German citizens.

In Study 3, 180 Mexican women answered the questionnaire. Four participants were excluded because they did not answer the manipulation check, another four because they failed the manipulation check question, and one more because she did not complete the questionnaire. The final sample consisted of 171 women. Participants' ages ranged between 18 and 36 years-old, with a mean age of 21.26 years ($SD = 2.65$, $Mdn = 21$). All were Mexican students from a southeast university in Mexico. An univariate ANOVA showed significant differences across samples in age, $F(2, 590) = 24.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .077$, being German participants older ($M=23.59$, $SD=4.29$) than Spanish ($M=22.02$, $SD=2.73$) and Mexican ones ($M=21.26$, $SD=2.65$).

According to effect sizes detected in Study 1 for ANOVA ($f = .25$; medium effect) using G*Power, we estimated a minimum sample of 154 participants to obtain a power $(1-\beta) = .80$.

For the same power standard, a minimum sample of 156 participants was needed, according to Monte Carlo simulation for indirect effects.

Procedure and measures. To collect the data for Study 2, three research assistants approached students who were on the university campus and invited them to take part in the study, offering sweets as an incentive. If they accepted, the students provided their e-mail addresses and were later sent an e-mail with a link to the 15-minute online survey. At the end of the survey, participants were debriefed and asked again for their e-mail addresses (stored separately from their answers) in case they wanted to participate in a raffle for one of five €20 Amazon vouchers. Participants in Study 3 were approached by one female researcher, who asked them to take part in a 15-minute paper-and-pencil survey. At the end, participants were thanked and debriefed.

The measures used in Studies 2 and 3 were the same as those used in Study 1 with the exceptions that in Study 2 we employed scales validated in German (or translated to German when no validations were available) and in Study 3 we adapted some items to the Mexican context. Both Study 2 (<https://osf.io/nfg8z>) and Study 3 (<https://osf.io/m4rqh>) were preregistered in the Open Science Framework platform.

Confrontation manipulation. In Studies 2 and 3, we used the same vignettes described in Study 1. A third experimental condition was incorporated in which the woman herself confronted the sexist comment. The content of the target confrontation was the same as in the male egalitarian condition, but in this case the woman gave the egalitarian argument.

Empowerment. We measured empowerment with the same eight items as in Study 1, either translated into German (Study 2: $\alpha = .84$) or adapted to the Mexican context (Study 3: $\alpha = .78$). In Study 3, we culturally adapted one item, replacing *estimulada* (i.e., stimulated) with

activada (i.e., activated).

Emotions. In Studies 2 and 3, we measured happiness and anger with the same items used in Study 1. In Study 2, for translation reasons, we included four items to measure anger instead of five because we did not find distinctive equivalent words for all of them. In Study 3, one item, *alicaída* (i.e., downcast), was culturally adapted, replaced by *desanimada* (i.e., disheartened). The main components of factor analysis with varimax rotation extracted two factors with eigenvalues larger than 1, which explained 67.32% of the variance in Study 2 and 71.55% of the variance in Study 3. The reliability coefficients were strong for happiness (Study 2: $\alpha = .93$; Study 3: $\alpha = .90$) and anger (Study 2: $\alpha = .92$; Study 3: $\alpha = .96$).

Confrontation intentions. They were measured with the same two items as in Study 1, with the addition of two more items (“I would try to make the guy see that his attitude is offensive” and “I would try to explain to the guy that his comment bothered me”). The reliability coefficient for the set of four items was acceptable in Study 2 ($\alpha = .85$) and in Study 3 ($\alpha = .75$).

Manipulation checks. We asked participants to remember the social interaction described in the vignettes and select the option that best summarized it (attention check). We offered them four possible options, one for each experimental condition and one additional in case they did not remember well what they had previously read. Because materials for the experimental manipulation had not been validated previously in a Mexican context, we also included in Study 3 the items used to validate the scenarios in the pilot study: four items to measure the perception of the confrontation as paternalistic ($\alpha = .67$) and seven items to measure the perception of the confronter as egalitarian ($\alpha = .89$).

In addition, participants rated their political orientation, endorsement of benevolent sexism, feminist identification, and self-description as agentic or communal, as well as answered

a modern sexism scale (these additional measures are described in detail in the online supplement.)

Results

Manipulation check. Most participants selected the correct attention check options in Study 2 (78, 97.5% in the target confrontation condition; 76, 96.2% in the male feminist confrontation; and 69, 95.8% in the male paternalistic confrontation) and in Study 3 (57, 100% in the target confrontation condition; 55, 93.2% in the male feminist confrontation; and 59, 100% in the male paternalistic confrontation).

Because materials had not been piloted in Study 3, we conducted a MANOVA to check that women perceived the confronter in an egalitarian or a paternalistic way, documenting a significant multivariate effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .659$, $F(2, 111) = 28.68$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .341$. A significant univariate effect of condition emerged on the set of feminist items, $F(1, 112) = 34.33$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .235$. Women perceived the confronter in the egalitarian condition as more egalitarian ($M = 4.84$, $SE = .19$) than the confronter in the paternalistic condition ($M = 3.27$, $SE = .19$). However, we again did not find an effect of condition on paternalistic items, $F(1, 112) = .63$, $p = .43$, $\eta_p^2 = .006$. Thus, these results replicate the findings in the Spanish and German pilot studies.

Women's empowerment and well-being. As in Study 1, we conducted a MANOVA to test whether there were differences in the empowerment and well-being (happiness and anger) that women experienced as a function of the scenario that they had previously read (target confrontation vs. egalitarian confrontation by man vs. paternalistic confrontation by man).

In Study 2, we found a significant multivariate main effect of type of confrontation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .373$, $F(6, 436) = 46.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .389$. A significant univariate effect of

confrontation emerged on empowerment, $F(2, 220) = 19.94, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .153$; happiness, $F(2, 220) = 57.53, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .343$; and anger, $F(2, 220) = 43.97, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .286$. Post hoc analyses (Sidak) revealed that participants reported feeling more empowered after a man's egalitarian confrontation than after a man's paternalistic confrontation, as in Study 1 (see Table 1b). Moreover, they experienced even more empowerment after target confrontation than after both types of men's confrontations. Concerning well-being, participants felt more happiness and less anger when men confronted in an egalitarian versus paternalistic way, as we found in Study 1. Additionally, participants felt more anger and less happiness after target confrontation than after men's (egalitarian and paternalistic) confrontations (see Table 1b). Thus, in Germany, Hypotheses 1a–c, 2a–c, and 3a–c were supported.

In Study 3, we found a significant multivariate main effect of type of confrontation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .367, F(6, 332) = 36.06, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .395$. A significant univariate effect of confrontation emerged on empowerment, $F(2, 168) = 8.81, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .095$; happiness, $F(2, 168) = 53.44, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .389$; and anger, $F(2, 168) = 68.79, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .450$. Post hoc (Sidak) analyses revealed that participants reported feeling more empowered after men's egalitarian rather than men's paternalistic confrontations and more empowered after target confrontation than after men's paternalistic confrontation (see Table 1c). There were no significant differences between target confrontation and men's egalitarian confrontation on empowerment, contrary to Study 2. With regard to well-being, as in Studies 1 and 2, participants felt more happiness and less anger when men confronted in an egalitarian versus paternalistic way. Also, as in Study 2, participants felt more anger and less happiness after target confrontation than after men's (egalitarian and paternalistic) confrontations (see Table 1c). Thus, in Mexico, Hypotheses 1a and 1c, 2a–c, and 3a–c were supported, but Hypothesis 1b was not.

Women's future intention to confront via empowerment and anger. As in Study 1, to know whether empowerment, anger, and happiness induced by the manipulation led women to express greater future intention to confront, we conducted process analyses (Hayes 2013) using 5,000 bootstrap samples to estimate bias-corrected standard errors and 95% percentile confidence intervals. We used a parallel mediational model (Model 4 in PROCESS) including empowerment, happiness, and anger as mediators (see Figure 1). Because the independent variable had three levels, to run these analyses we created two contrasts. To replicate the results of Study 1, in Contrast 1 we compared men's egalitarian confrontation (coded 1) versus men's paternalistic confrontation (coded -1; target confrontation coded 0). In Contrast 2, we compared target confrontation (coded 2) to men's confrontations (egalitarian -1; paternalistic = -1). All the analyses were conducted including Contrast 1 as the main predictor and Contrast 2 as a covariate to control for it.

In Study 2 (Germany), the total effect of Contrast 1 (egalitarian vs. paternalistic confrontation) on future intention to confront was significant ($b = -.47$, 95% CI $[-.88, -.06]$, $p = .024$), as well as the indirect effect through empowerment ($b = .16$, 95% CI $[.02, .37]$) and anger ($b = -.21$, 95% CI $[-.44, -.06]$), but not through happiness ($b = .01$, 95% CI $[-.11, .16]$) (see Table 2b). The direct effect was significant ($b = -.44$, 95% CI $[-.86, -.01]$, $p = .046$). However, in Study 3 (Mexico), the total effect of this contrast was not significant ($b = -.11$, 95% CI $[-.35, .13]$, $p = .353$), but the indirect effect via empowerment was ($b = .09$, 95% CI $[.02, .22]$) (see Table 2c). No other indirect effects were found in Study 3 (anger: $b = -.05$, 95% CI $[-.17, .03]$; happiness: $b = .02$, 95% CI $[-.09, .13]$). The direct effect was not significant ($b = -.18$, 95% CI $[-.43, .07]$, $p = .167$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported in Germany and Mexico, whereas Hypothesis 5 was supported in Germany but not in Mexico.

Table 2

Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects of Type of Confrontation (Egalitarian or Paternalistic) on Women's Intention to Confront via Feeling of Power, Happiness, and Anger

	Panel A: Study 1 (Spain) <i>n</i> = 198		Panel B: Study 2 (Germany) <i>n</i> = 223		Panel C: Study 3 (Mexico) <i>n</i> = 170	
	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	95% CI	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	95% CI	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	95% CI
Total effect	.07 (.24)	[-.39, .54]	-.47 (.21)	[-.88, -.06]	-.11 (.12)	[-.35, .13]
Direct effect	.13 (.25)	[-.36, .62]	-.44 (.22)	[-.86, -.01]	-.18 (.13)	[-.43, .07]
Indirect effect: Empowerment	.22 (.10)	[.07, .46]	.16 (.09)	[.02, .37]	.09 (.05)	[-.02, .21]
Indirect effect: Happiness	.02 (.13)	[-.23, .29]	.01 (.06)	[-.11, .16]	.02 (.05)	[-.09, .13]
Indirect effect: Anger	-.30 (.14)	[-.63, -.07]	-.21 (.09)	[-.44, -.06]	-.05 (.05)	[-.17, .07]

Summary of the Results across Studies

The effects of type of men's confrontation on women's empowerment and well-being found in Study 1 were replicated in two different cultural contexts (Study 2: Germany and Study 3: Mexico). Men's egalitarian confrontation had beneficial effects on women compared to paternalistic confrontation because it made women feel more empowered, happier, and less angry. Concerning the expected differences between target confrontation and men's (egalitarian and paternalistic) confrontations, in Germany and Mexico, participants felt more empowered after target confrontation than after paternalistic men's confrontation, in line with our hypotheses. However, whereas in Germany participants also felt more empowered after target confrontation than after male egalitarian confrontation, this was not the case in Mexico. That is, Mexican women were equally empowered by target confrontation and men's egalitarian confrontation. Both in Germany and in Mexico, we found that when women imagined that they were the confronters (target confrontation condition), they experienced less happiness and more anger than after men's egalitarian and paternalistic confrontations. This pattern is consistent with the fact that women consider confrontation aversive (Czopp and Monteith 2003; Dodd et al. 2002; Eliezer and Major 2012).

Regarding the indirect effects of type of confrontation on women's future intention to confront, the results in Germany and Mexico confirmed that empowerment experienced after men's egalitarian (vs. paternalistic) confrontation led women to express greater future intention to confront. However, the more anger women experienced after paternalistic (vs. egalitarian) confrontation also pushed them to confront in Germany (but not in Mexico). Thus, in Study 2, we replicated the results of Study 1 in Spain with a German sample, but some differences emerged in Mexico (Study 3). To check the stability of the results with a larger sample, we decided to conduct an integrative data analysis with the three datasets pooled into one (Curran and Hussong 2009), taking into consideration only the two experimental conditions present in the three studies (men's egalitarian vs. paternalistic confrontations).

Pooled Analyses of Studies 1, 2, and 3

Across studies, there was evidence that women react differently to paternalistic and egalitarian confrontation. To provide insight into the robustness of the central effect, we pooled the data following an integrative data analysis approach (Curran and Hussong 2009), which allowed us not only to test the possible differences among countries but to check the main results of Studies 1–3 with more statistical power and sample heterogeneity. First, we tested whether men's egalitarian confrontation increased women's empowerment and happiness (Hypotheses 1 and 2) and decreased anger (Hypothesis 3) compared to men's paternalistic confrontation. Further, the data pooled from Studies 1–3 provide stronger statistical power to explore the role of feminist identification and endorsement of benevolent sexism as possible moderators of the effects of type of confrontation on women's empowerment and emotions. According to previous literature, we consider that the effects of type of confrontation might be most pronounced for women highly identified as feminists and those who endorse less benevolently sexist beliefs.

Finally, we conducted a parallel mediation model (Model 4 in PROCESS; Hayes, 2013) to test the effect of male egalitarian confrontation in predicting women's future intention to confront via empowerment and anger (Hypothesis 4 & 5), and we also explored the role of happiness.

Method

Participants. The total sample included 457 participants ($n_1 = 198$; $n_2 = 145$; $n_3 = 114$). Note that the difference in sample size of Study 2 ($n = 223$) and Study 3 ($n = 171$) is due to the fact that, in the pooled analyses, we did not include the target confrontation condition. We conducted a sensitivity analysis using G*power (Faul et al. 2007) to determine the effect size the current study could detect. Results showed that with $\alpha = 0.5$ and $1 - \beta$ (power) = .80, for a sample size of 457 participants, the minimum effect size that we could detect for a unifactorial ANOVA was $f = 0.13$, and for a multiple regression with four predictors it was $f^2 = .02$.

Measures. Beyond the measures described in the corresponding sections of Studies 1–3, participants reported their gender and feminist identification as well as their endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs before the manipulation.

Gender and feminist identification. These were measured with two items: “To what extent do you identify with your gender/ feminists?” (adapted from Doosje et al. 1998) and “To what extent do you feel a bond with other members of your gender/ feminist people?” (adapted from Leach et al. 2008), scored from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). In Studies 1 and 3 items were written in Spanish, whereas in Study 2 they were written in German. The Pearson correlation between both items was good for feminist identification in all the studies (Study 1: $r = .80$, $M = 5.95$, $SD = 1.27$; Study 2: $r = .83$, $M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.64$; Study 3: $r = .89$, $M = 4.59$, $SD = 1.48$) but not for gender identification (Study 1: $r = .13$; Study 2: $r = .45$; Study 3: $r = .29$). Gender identification thus was not included in our analyses. The two items for Feminist

Identification were averaged so that higher scores indicated stronger identification.

Benevolent sexism. This was measured using the six items of the short version (Rollero et al. 2014) of the Benevolent Sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1996; Spanish version by Expósito et al. 1998; German version by Eckes and Six-Materna 1999), which showed it had good psychometric properties in all studies (Study 1: $\alpha = .80$, $M = .88$, $SD = .88$; Study 2: $\alpha = .78$, $M = 1.50$, $SD = .98$; Study 3: $\alpha = .75$, $M = 1.37$, $SD = .92$). Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate stronger endorsement of benevolent sexism.

Results

Women's empowerment and well-being. We conducted a MANOVA to compare whether there were differences in empowerment, anger, and happiness that women experienced based on type of confrontation (men's egalitarian vs. paternalistic) by country (Spain vs. Germany vs. Mexico). We found significant multivariate main effects of type of confrontation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .859$, $F(4, 447) = 18.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .141$, and country, Wilks's $\Lambda = .944$, $F(8, 894) = 3.25$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .028$, but interaction between type of confrontation by country was not significant, Wilks's $\Lambda = .970$, $F(8, 894) = 1.69$, $p < .096$, $\eta_p^2 = .015$.

A significant univariate effects of type of confrontation emerged on empowerment, $F(1, 450) = 42.72$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .087$; happiness, $F(1, 450) = 44.16$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .089$; and anger, $F(1, 450) = 53.27$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .106$. Participants reported feeling significantly more empowered after male egalitarian confrontation than after paternalistic confrontation (see Table 1d). Likewise, participants felt more happiness and less anger after male egalitarian versus paternalistic confrontation. Thus, Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were supported.

A significant univariate effect of country also emerged on anger, $F(2, 450) = 7.13$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .031$. Post hoc (Sidak) analyses revealed that in Spain ($M = 4.75$, $SE = .19$) and

Germany ($M = 4.6$, $SE = .22$), women experienced significantly more anger than in Mexico ($M = 3.62$, $SE = .25$). No other significant differences among countries were found, $F_s < 1.98$, $p_s > .140$, nor was an interaction effect between type of confrontation and country found, $F_s < 1.03$, $p > .358$.

Women's empowerment and well-being as a function of benevolent sexism and feminist identification. To check whether the results were contingent on participants' feminist identification and benevolent sexism, we conducted a moderation analysis through Hayes' (2013) PROCESS command (Model 1) using 5,000 bootstrap samples to estimate bias-corrected standard errors and 95% percentile confidence intervals. We reported these analyses with pooled data from Studies 1–3 rather than each study separately to increase statistical power, which allows us to detect small effect sizes. We found an interaction of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) (a) with feminist identification on empowerment ($b = .22$, 95% CI [.02, .42], $p = .034$), happiness ($b = .45$, 95% CI [.21, .69], $p < .001$), and anger ($b = -.48$, 95% CI [-.77, -.19], $p = .001$), and (b) with benevolent sexism on empowerment ($b = -.46$, 95% CI [-.82, -.11], $p = .010$), happiness ($b = -.80$, 95% CI [-1.21, -.39], $p < .001$), and anger ($b = 1.05$, 95% CI [.55, 1.55], $p < .001$). The more women identify as feminists, the less happiness and more anger they experienced after men's paternalistic confrontation. Likewise, the lower the benevolent sexism, the less empowerment and happiness and the more anger they experienced after paternalistic confrontation. Conditional effects are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

Conditional Effects of Feminist Identification and Benevolent Sexism on Women's Empowerment, Happiness, and Anger under Two Types of Confrontation

Type of Male Confrontation	Empowerment		Happiness		Anger	
	<i>b</i> (SE)	95% CI	<i>b</i> (SE)	95% CI	<i>b</i> (SE)	95% CI
(a) Conditional Effect of Feminist Identification						
Paternalistic	-.10 (.08)	[-.24, .05]	-.30 (.09)	[-.48, -.13]	.48 (.11)	[.27, .69]
Egalitarian	.12 (.07)	[-.01, .26]	.15 (.08)	[-.02, .31]	.00 (.10)	[-.19, .20]
(b) Conditional Effect of Benevolent Sexism						
Paternalistic	.49 (.13)	[.22, .75]	1.06 (.15)	[.76, 1.37]	-.99 (.19)	[-1.36, -.62]
Egalitarian	.02 (.12)	[-.21, .26]	.26 (.14)	[-.01, .54]	.06 (.17)	[-.24, .40]

Note. Polled data ($n = 456$).

An example of this pattern of results using anger as an outcome variable is represented in Figure 2. It is important to note that even though the interactions reported are significant, the interaction between type of confrontation with both feminist identification and benevolent sexism on empowerment was still underpowered, so it must be interpreted with caution. In fact, although the interaction effect between feminist identification and type of confrontation on empowerment is significant, conditional effects are not (see Table 3).




Figure 2. Interaction between feminist identification and type of confrontation and on women's anger (pooled data). Lower and Higher Feminist Identification represent -1 SD and +1 SD from the mean, respectively.

Women's future intention to confront via empowerment and anger. The total effect of type of confrontation on women's future intention to confront was not significant ($b = -.32$, 95% CI $[-.66, .03]$, $p = .072$). The indirect effect through empowerment was significant ($b = .14$, 95% CI $[.03, .28]$), as well as through anger ($b = -.21$, 95% CI $[-.39, -.06]$), but not through happiness ($b = .06$, 95% CI $[-.10, .22]$). The direct effect was not significant ($b = -.31$, 95% CI $[-.68, .06]$, $p = .115$). These results confirmed that the more empowerment women reported after egalitarian (vs. paternalistic) confrontation and the more anger they felt after paternalistic (vs. egalitarian) confrontation, the more they expressed greater future intention to confront. However, the more happiness women experienced after egalitarian (vs. paternalistic) confrontation did not lead them to express greater future intention to confront (see Table 2d). Thus, when we pooled the data of Studies 1–3, the results confirmed Hypotheses 4 and 5.

General Discussion

Our primary aims were to investigate the effects of men's egalitarian versus paternalistic confrontation of sexism on women and to analyze their implications for women's willingness to confront sexism. We conducted three studies in three different cultural contexts (Spain, Germany, and Mexico) to replicate and test the generalizability of our findings. Beyond some small differences found between studies (see discussion of Study 1 and summary results section of Studies 2 & 3), the results of integrative data analyses (Curran and Hussong 2009) confirmed that male egalitarian confrontation made women report feeling more empowered (Hypothesis 1), happier (Hypothesis 2), and less angry (Hypothesis 3) compared to paternalistic confrontation.

The results highlight that men's confrontation not only affects women's emotions and attitudes but also indirectly influences their future intention to confront. Interestingly, the results showed two pathways. If men confront sexism for feminist reasons, women report more empowerment and happiness, but only empowerment makes women more willing to engage in sexism confrontation (Hypothesis 4). But if men confront sexism for paternalistic reasons, women experience anger, which increases their interest in confronting as well (Hypothesis 5). Thus, our results suggest that to consider men as genuine allies in fighting inequality, it is important that their actions promote women's empowerment because increasing women's happiness does not guarantee their engagement in future sexism confrontation. However, women can also experience anger as a reaction against paternalistic advantaged group members, and this anger may encourage women to confront sexism even more, especially if they identify with being feminist and weakly endorse benevolently sexist beliefs.

Positive Consequences of Egalitarian Confrontation

Male confrontation of sexism may create an anti-sexist atmosphere where men might be seen as allies against sexism (Cihangir et al. 2014). Social support is a key factor in promoting social change (van Zomeren et al. 2004); thus, men's confrontation of sexism could be interpreted as a form of supportive intergroup contact (Droogendyck, Wright et al. 2016). However, paternalistic or egalitarian motives might drive men's confrontation (Estevan-Reina et al. 2020), and our results suggest that the motivations underlying advantaged group members' actions determine the extent to which their actions may be beneficial, but also harmful, for disadvantaged group members. These findings support the need to consider underlying motivations not only when we analyze advantaged group members' actions against inequality (Estevan-Reina et al. 2020; Radke et al. 2020), but also when we try to understand the impact of

these actions on disadvantaged groups. Importantly, men's egalitarian confrontation of sexism can be as empowering as when women themselves confront sexism, as our results from Mexico show. However, target confrontation made women report more empowerment than men's egalitarian confrontation in Germany. These results are consistent with literature that shows that women's confrontation increases their sense of competence, self-esteem, and empowerment (Gervais et al. 2010; Hyers 2007).

The harmful effects of paternalistic confrontation were mostly evident on well-being. When the target confrontation condition was included (Studies 2 and 3), this was the most aversive type of confrontation (i.e., it made women report more anger and less happiness than male confrontation) both in Germany and Mexico. This result is consistent with previous literature which showed the costs of confrontation for targets of prejudice (Kaiser and Miller 2001) and for women in particular (Czopp and Monteith 2003; Dodd et al. 2002; Eliezer and Major 2012; Gervais and Hillard 2014). However, although male confrontation reduces women's well-being, this does not justify preventing women from confronting sexism themselves, as our results on empowerment show.

The effects of confrontation on empowerment and well-being also depended on women's feminist identification and endorsement of benevolent sexism. The more women identify as feminists (and the less they endorse benevolently sexist beliefs), the more anger but less happiness they experienced after paternalistic confrontation. Also, the less benevolently sexist they were, the less empowerment they experienced after paternalistic confrontation. Unlike Wiley and Dunne (2019), we did not find that the positive effects of egalitarian confrontation occurred only for strongly feminist-identified women. It is important to notice that, unlike the work by these prior authors, in the current work we do not use the "feminist" label to describe

any of the confronters. A man labeled as a feminist who acts in a condescending way (such as offering dependency-oriented help) is not perceived positively by women who are more motivated to challenge gender inequality. This might explain why Wiley and Dunne's participants viewed feminist men who offered autonomy-oriented help as better allies. Perhaps differences between both works concerning independent variables (sexism confrontation—ours vs. helping behavior—Wiley and Dunne) and dependent variables (empowerment and emotions—ours – vs. perception of allies—Wiley and Dunne) may also explain the different findings. Despite differences, the two works are complementary because they place emphasis on women's feminist identification to understand both the rejection of male condescending treatment and the acceptance of egalitarian treatment. These results are consistent with the predictions of intergroup helping relations as status relations (Nadler 2002), confirming that highly identified disadvantaged group members may reject dependency-oriented help or seek and accept autonomy-oriented help if they believe that they can succeed by themselves as capable actors.

Empowerment (not Happiness) Encourages Women to Keep Fighting

The positive effects of men's confrontation on women's well-being are no guarantee that these will translate into future actions to resist sexism. Literature on prejudice reduction has evidenced positive effects of intergroup contact on attitudes and emotions toward the outgroup on an interpersonal level (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006), whereas collective action literature has shown that this improvement in intergroup relations may undermine social change (Hasan-Aslih et al. 2019; Saguy et al. 2009; Wright and Lubensky 2009). In line with this argument, our results showed that improved happiness after egalitarian confrontation did not increase women's future intention to confront, whether in Spain, Germany, or Mexico.

However, in the three countries, our results showed that improved empowerment

encouraged women to keep fighting against sexism. This result is consistent with literature that points out that advantaged group members' actions do not undermine social change if they recognize the inequality as illegitimate (Becker et al. 2013), and they can even promote change if they offer disadvantaged group members supportive contact (Droogendyk, Louis et al. 2016). But our study goes one step further in uncovering the underlying mechanism of this positive effect by highlighting the role of empowerment in promoting social change, over and above positive emotions. In a similar line, a very recent work found that satisfying the need for empowerment of disadvantaged groups during intergroup contact is related with their support for social change (Hässler et al. 2020).

Thus, subtyping advantaged group members who show a commitment to fighting inequality as allies (or not) might be a useful strategy to manage positive intergroup relations without undermining social change (Wright and Lubensky 2009). To become allies, advantaged group members must have a genuine interest in improving the status of the disadvantaged group (outgroup focused motivation: Radke et al. 2020; egalitarian motivation: Estevan-Reina et al. 2020) and not override women's agency, but empower them to keep fighting.

Women's Resistance to Paternalistic Confrontation

Women are not passive recipients of discrimination (Swim and Hyers 1999), and recent work showed that women oppose men's actions when these are motivated by paternalistic reasons (Estevan-Reina et al. 2020). Previous research showed that college-educated men try to appear non-prejudiced and progressive, caring, and respectful of women (Lamont 2015), but still many of them may perpetuate inequality when they do not challenge gender power asymmetries in society. Our results are consistent with research showing that even subtle forms of discrimination can trigger resistance responses in women (de Lemus et al. 2018), even when they

are not aware of it, if they have internalized egalitarian norms (van Breen et al. 2018). That feminist identification moderates these effects supports this resistance interpretation. The more women identify with feminists, the more anger they reported in response to paternalistic confrontation. This is also in line with findings from the helping relations as power relations model with regard to the idea that highly identified in-group members may reject dependency-oriented help (Nadler 2002). We found the increase in anger after paternalistic confrontation not only in more egalitarian countries (Germany and Spain) but also in less egalitarian ones (Mexico), where support for benevolent sexism is higher (Glick et al. 2000).

When we pooled the datasets, we found that paternalistic (vs. egalitarian) confrontation leads women to express greater future intention to confront via anger. We can interpret these findings as resistance to paternalism. Sexism threatens women's freedom, and male paternalistic confrontation may strengthen this threat, activating the idea that women cannot stand up for themselves. This reasoning would explain why the women across our studies reported not only feeling more anger after paternalistic rather than egalitarian confrontation, but also that their enhanced anger leads them to express greater future intention to confront to restore their agency.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

The measures used in our work might have triggered responses influenced by task demand characteristics. To address this point, future research could compare egalitarian and paternalistic confrontation with a sexist situation in which there is no confrontation at all, or even with some neutral event like non-sexist bullying, as well as include behavioral measures to increase ecological validity. Adding a control condition would also help us explain women's resistance toward paternalistic confrontation. Perhaps paternalistic confrontation is still more empowering than no confrontation, or perhaps it is equally annoying. In addition, combining the

confrontation motivation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) with the gender of the source (women vs. men) might contribute to understanding whether both women's and men's paternalistic confrontation have the same negative effects on women.

Furthermore, although we collected data in three countries, our college samples are not sufficiently heterogeneous. Furthermore, the sexist situation is always the same (i.e., an episode of street sexual harassment). More diversity in sample composition (in terms of age, political orientation, cultural backgrounds, etc.) and in the scenarios described would contribute to making our findings more solid. In addition, more research would help us to know whether we can generalize our results to other prosocial behaviors beyond confrontation and to other intergroup relations beyond gender inequality.

An interesting direction for future research would be to differentiate group emotions (against the perpetrator of the sexist comment or toward gender inequality itself) and interpersonal emotions (toward the confronter). For instance, it is possible that women experience positive emotions toward egalitarian confronters (interpersonal happiness) and, at the same time, that egalitarian confrontation triggers more anger toward gender inequality (intergroup anger). This possibility may help us to understand why positive cross-group contact in interpersonal relations, if supportive, can contribute to social change.

Future research should also explore whether paternalistic confrontation might have a cumulative effect that makes women perceive the sexist comment not as an isolated act but as a pervasive reality (i.e., a double threat) (Garcia, Schmitt, Branscombe, & Ellemers 2009). Furthermore, in our study we did not directly assess the motivations that women attribute to confronters and perhaps women may still doubt the sincerity of advantaged group members' expressed motivations. In all studies, women perceived both confronters as equally paternalistic

(although different in terms of sexism), which suggests that women may not be entirely convinced that the egalitarian confronter is truly egalitarian.

We conceptualized confrontation of discrimination as intergroup behavior that is close to helping behavior; however, confrontation can also be seen as an act of moral courage when it is aimed at restoring a violated moral standard (Halmburger et al. 2015). The two conceptualizations overlap in the case of the “egalitarian confronter,” which is when the confrontation is motivated by moral or equality concerns. In contrast, when the confrontation is motivated by paternalistic concerns, it cannot be seen as a moral courage because it does not aim to address the violated norm (Kayser, Greitemeyer, Fischer, & Frey 2010). Importantly, behaviors that are considered as morally courageous also involve (potential) risks for those who engage in it (Halmburger et al. 2015). From this perspective, a paternalistic confronter may face less backlash from other advantaged group members because he reaffirms and does not challenge the existing hierarchies. Future research could examine whether women respect an egalitarian confronter more than a paternalistic one because they assume that expressing support for equality is more likely to be punished by other advantaged group members.

Practice Implications

Over the last few years, because of the rise of feminist claims (e.g., #MeToo movement, women’s marches, feminist strikes), the role of men in fighting gender inequality has become a relevant issue. Although men can be involved in change toward gender inequality (Subašić et al. 2018; Wiley et al. 2012), our findings show that not every male confrontation of sexism has positive consequences for women. This information can be useful for policymakers and activists who develop both social interventions and campaigns aimed at involving men in fighting gender inequality. Furthermore, our research can inspire those men who want to become true allies of

women to do it in a way that promotes social change. We encourage men to act against sexism and endorse egalitarian (instead of paternalistic) values—that is, to identify the comment as discriminatory (sexist; Cihangir 2014) and illegitimate (unfair; Becker et al. 2013) and to oppose the notion that women are inferior to men (Droogendyk, Louis et al. 2016). In this way, male sexism confrontation will not only make women experience more well-being but also empower them to keep fighting.

Conclusions

The rise of women's movements for gender equality in the last years has been accompanied by an increase (although still modest) in support by men in this endeavor. However, whereas some men have a real egalitarian motivation, others may be motivated by paternalistic reasons. Our research conveyed that advantaged group members' actions motivated by genuine egalitarian reasons empower women, which encourages women to keep fighting. However, confrontation motivated by paternalistic reasons makes women feel anger (especially among those who identify more as feminist and endorse less benevolently sexist beliefs), which pushes them to not keep quiet, perhaps as resistance against acts that may still be reinforcing gender hierarchies.

From a theoretical point of view, our research contributes to understanding the impact of confrontation on targets of discrimination in intergroup relations. Following the distinction between dependency- and autonomy-oriented help (Nadler 2002) and positive and supportive contact (Droogendyk, Louis et al. 2016), the distinction between egalitarian and paternalistic confrontation allows the identification of two existing ways of confronting discrimination with different implications for women. Further, beyond sexism confrontation, our current work highlights the role of empowerment and anger as mechanisms to understand in which cases

advantaged group members' actions promote social change or reinforce social hierarchies, at least from the perspective of a disadvantaged group.

References

- Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 1–45). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(5), 633–642. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.270>
- Becker, J. C., Tausch, N., & Wagner, U. (2011). Emotional consequences of collective action participation: Differentiating self-directed and outgroup-directed emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(12), 1587–1598. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211414145>
- Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(1), 62–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022615>
- Becker, J. C., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. E., & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or ally: Whether cross-group contact undermines collective action depends on what advantaged group members say (or don't say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(4), 442–455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213477155>
- Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 3–18.
- Cihangir, S., Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2014). Men as allies against sexism: The positive effects of a suggestion of sexism by male (vs. female) sources. *SAGE Open, 4*(2), 215824401453916. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014539168>

- Curran, P. J., & Hussong, A. M. (2009). Integrative data analysis: The simultaneous analysis of multiple data sets. *Psychological Methods*, 14(2), 81–100.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015914>
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(4), 532–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>
- de Lemus, S., Spears, R., Lupiáñez, J., Bukowski, M., & Moya, M. (2018). Automatic ingroup bias as resistance to traditional gender roles? *Social Psychological Bulletin*, 13(4), e29080. <https://doi.org/10.32872/spb.v13i4.29080>
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(4), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
- Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutel, J. M., & Moran, B. E. (2002). Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles*, 45, 567–577.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014866915741>
- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N.R., Spears, R., & Manstead A. SR. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), 872-86. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.872>
- Droogendyk, L., Louis, W. R., & Wright, S. C. (2016). Renewed promise for positive cross-group contact: The role of supportive contact in empowering collective action. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 48(4), 317-327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000058>
- Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. & Louis, W. R. (2016). Acting in solidarity: Cross-group contact between disadvantaged group members and advantaged group allies.

- Journal of Social Issues*, 72(2), 315-334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12168>
- Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 637–652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12083>
- Drury, J., Evripidou, A., & Van Zomeren, M. (2015). Empowerment: The intersection of identity and power in collective action. In D. Sindic, M. Barreto, & R. Costa-Lopes (Eds.), *Power and identity* (pp. 94–116). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Eliezer, D., & Major, B. (2012). It's not your fault: The social costs of claiming discrimination on behalf of someone else. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(4), 487–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211432894>
- Eckes, T., & Six-Materna, I. (1999). Hostilität und Benevolenz: Eine Skala zur Erfassung des ambivalenten Sexismus [Hostility and benevolence: A scale measuring ambivalent sexism]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 30(4), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1024//0044-3514.30.4.211>
- Edwards, K. E. (2006). Aspiring social justice ally identity development: A conceptual model. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1722>
- Estevan-Reina, L., de Lemus, S., & Megías, J. L. (2020). Feminist or paternalistic: Understanding men's motivations to confront sexism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2988. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02988>
- Expósito, F., Moya, M & Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos [Ambivalent sexism: measurement and correlates]. *Revista de Psicología social*, 13(2), 159–169.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*

- Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Garcia, D. M., Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., & Ellemers, N. (2009). Women's reactions to ingroup members who protest discriminatory treatment: The importance of beliefs about inequality and response appropriateness. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40, 733–745. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.644>
- Gervais, S. J., & Hillard, A. L. (2014). Confronting sexism as persuasion: Effects of a confrontation's recipient, source, message, and context. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 653–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12084>
- Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting sexism: The role of relationship orientation and gender. *Sex Roles*, 63(7–8), 463–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7>
- Huis, M. A., Hansen, N., Otten, S., & Lensink, R. (2017). A three-dimensional model of women's empowerment: Implications in the field of microfinance and future directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1678. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01678>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491–512.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763–775. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763>
- Gómez, M. V. (March 9th, 2019). Una movilización masiva exhibe en las calles la fuerza del feminismo [A massive mobilization exhibits the power of feminism on the streets]. *El País*. Retrieved from

- https://elpais.com/sociedad/2019/03/08/actualidad/1552079524_186232.html
- Good, J. J., Sanchez, D. T., & Moss-Racusin, C. A. (2018). A paternalistic duty to protect? Predicting men's decisions to confront sexism. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19(1), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000077>
- Grodira, F., Borrás, J., Cela, D., Albin, D. (March 8th, 2018). 8M: El feminismo hace historia en España [March 8th: Feminism makes history in Spain]. *Público*. Retrieved from <https://www.publico.es/sociedad/manifestacion-8m-madrid-8-m-feminismo-historia.html>
- Halmburger, A., Baumert, A., & Schmitt, M. (2015). Anger as driving factor of moral courage in comparison with guilt and global mood: A multimethod approach: emotional determinants of moral courage. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(1), 39-51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2071>
- Hasan-Aslih, S., Pliskin, R., Shuman, E., van Zomeren, M., Saguy, T., & Halperin, E., (in press). The dilemma of “sleeping with the enemy”: A first examination of what (de)motivates disadvantaged group members to partake in joint collective action [Preprint]. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/sbe3d>
- Hasan-Aslih, S., Pliskin, R., van Zomeren, M., Halperin, E., & Saguy, T. (2019). A darker side of hope: Harmony-focused hope decreases collective action intentions among the disadvantaged. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(2), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672187831>
- Hässler, T., Ullrich, J., Sebben, S., Shnabel, N., Bernardino, M., Valdenegro, D., ... Pistella, J. (2020). Needs satisfaction in intergroup contact: A multi-national study of pathways toward social change [Preprint]. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/f9mwv>
- Hayes, A. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process*

analysis : A regression-based approach. New York: The Guilford Press.

Hornsey, M. J., Blackwood, L., Louis, W., Fielding, K., Mavor, K., Morton, T., ... White, K. M.

(2006). Why do people engage in collective action? Revisiting the role of perceived effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(7), 1701–1722.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00077.x>

Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-black racism, anti-semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles*, 56(1–2), 1–12.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8>

Iyer, A., Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2007). Why individuals protest the perceived transgressions of their country: The role of anger, shame, and guilt. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(4), 572–587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206297402>

Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 498–509. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498>

Kaiser, C.R., & Miller, C.T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(2), 254–263.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010>

Kende, A., Nyúl, B., Lantos, N. A., Hadarics, M., Petlitski, D., Kehl, J., & Shnabel, N. (2020). A needs-based support for #MeToo: Power and morality needs shape women's and men's support of the campaign. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 593.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00593>

Kutlaca, M., Becker, J., & Radke, H. (2019). A hero for the outgroup, a black sheep for the ingroup: Societal perceptions of those who confront discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. Advance online publication.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103832>

Lamont, E. (2015). The limited construction of an egalitarian masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 18(3), 271–292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X14557495>

Leach, C.W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S.F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J.W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 144–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144>

Louis, W. R., Thomas, E., Chapman, C. M., Achia, T., Wibisono, S., Mirnajafi, Z., & Droogendyk, L. (2019). Emerging research on intergroup prosociality: Group members' charitable giving, positive contact, allyship, and solidarity with others. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(3), e12436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12436>

Mallett, R. K., & Melchiori, K. J. (2014). Goal preference shapes confrontations of sexism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(5), 646–656.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214521468>

Mallett, R. K., & Wagner, D. E. (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(1), 215–220.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.001>

Moya-Garófano, A., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2018). Stranger harassment (“piropo”) and women’s self-objectification: The role of anger, happiness,

- and empowerment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1–21. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518760258>
- Nadler, A. (2002). Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Maintaining or challenging social dominance between groups through helping. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 487–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00272>
- Niesta Kayser, D., Greitemeyer, T., Fischer, P & Frey, D. (2010). Why mood affects help giving, but not moral courage: Comparing two types of prosocial behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(7), 1136-57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.717>
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Pratto, F. (2016). On power and empowerment. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 55(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12135>
- Radke, H., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Changing versus protecting the status quo: Why men and women engage in different types of action on behalf of women. *Sex Roles*, 79(10), 505-518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0884-2>
- Radke, H. R. M., Kutlaca, M., Siem, B., Wright, S. C., & Becker, J. C. (2020). Beyond allyship: Motivations for advantaged group members to engage in action for disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868320918698>
- Rollero, C, Glick, P., & Tartaglia, (2014). Psychometric properties of short versions of the ambivalent sexism inventory and ambivalence toward men inventory. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology* 21(2):149–159. . <https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM21.2.3>

- Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 114–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x>
- Sanz, J. (2001). Un instrumento para evaluar la eficacia de los procedimientos de inducción de estado de ánimo: La «escala de valoración del estado de ánimo» (EVEA). *Análisis y Modificación de Conducta*, 27(111), 71–110.
- Shnabel, N., Bar-Anan, Y., Kende, A., Bareket, O., & Lazar, Y. (2016). Help to perpetuate traditional gender roles: Benevolent sexism increases engagement in dependency-oriented cross-gender helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110(1), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000037>
- Shnabel, N., & Nadler, A. (2015). The role of agency and morality in reconciliation processes: The perspective of the needs-based model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(6), 477–483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415601625>
- Shnabel, N., Nadler, A., Ullrich, J., Dovidio, J. F., & Carmi, D. (2009). Promoting reconciliation through the satisfaction of the emotional needs of victimized and perpetrating group members: The needs-based model of reconciliation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(8), 1021–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209336610>
- Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56(4), 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.319>
- Subašić, E., Hardacre, S., Elton, B., Branscombe, N. R., Ryan, M. K., & Reynolds, K. J. (2018). “We for She”: Mobilising men and women to act in solidarity for gender equality. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(5), 707–724.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218763272>

- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—What did you just say?!: Women’s public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1), 68–88. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1370>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York: Blackwell.
- United Nations Development Programme: Human Development Reports. (2017). *Gender Inequality Index*. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/GII>
- van Breen, J. A., Spears, R., Kuppens, T., & de Lemus, S. (2018). Subliminal gender stereotypes: Who can resist? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(12), 1648–1663. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672187718>
- van Zomeren, M., Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2012). Protesters as “passionate economists”: A dynamic dual pathway model of approach coping with collective disadvantage. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(2), 180–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311430835>
- van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(4), 504–35. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504>
- van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A. H., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Put your money where

your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(5), 649–664.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.649>

Wiley, S., & Dunne, C. (2019). Comrades in the struggle? Feminist women prefer male allies who offer autonomy- not dependency-oriented help. *Sex Roles*, 80, 656–666.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0970-0>

Wiley, S., Srinivasan, R., Finke, E., Firnhaber, J., & Shilinsky, A. (2012). Positive portrayals of feminist men increase men's solidarity with feminists and collective action intentions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(1), 61–71.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312464575>

Wright, S. C., & Lubensky, M. E. (2009). The struggle for social equality: Collective action versus prejudice reduction. In *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities* (pp. 291–310). New York: Psychology Press.

Yoder, J., & Kahn, A. (1992). Toward a feminist understanding of women and power.

Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 381–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00263.x>

Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Psychological empowerment: Issues and illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23(5), 581–599. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02506983>

Online supplement for Estevan-Reina, L., de Lemus, S., Megias, J. L., Kutlaca, M., Belmonte-Garcia, M., and Becker, J. (2020). Allies against sexism: The impact of men's egalitarian versus paternalistic confrontation on women's empowerment and well-being. *Sex Roles*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01184-4>

SUPPLEMENT A: DESCRIPTION OF ADDITIONAL MEASURES AND RESULTS

Study 1

Measures

Here we discuss measures that were included in the first study that are not described in the main text.

Political orientation. This was measured with one single item ("How would you define your political orientation?") in a bipolar scale from 1 (extreme left) to 7 (extreme right) ($M=3.07$; $SD=1.25$).

Other emotions. In addition to hostility and happiness, the Escala de Valoración del Estado de Ánimo (EVEA) [Scale for Mood Assessment] (Sanz 2001) also included subscales of anxiety (nervous, tense, anxious, and restless; $\alpha=.85$); and sadness –depression (melancholy, depressed, downcast, and sad; $\alpha=.72$), so these emotions were also evaluated. Factor loadings of the principal components analysis of emotions (including items of anger, happiness, sadness and anxiety) can be seen in Table 1s.

Body response. An avatar measured participants' postural attitude when presented with the vignettes, on a 7-point scale ranging from a more constricted posture (submissive) to a more expanded one (dominant)

Women's self-descriptions as agentic and communal were measured through an adaptation of the short form of the Bem Sex-Role inventory (BSRI; Bem 1974; Colley et al. 2009). Further, we added two extra items previously used in the literature to measure agency

(“adventurous” and “competitive”; Bosak et al. 2008). We conducted a factorial analysis, which reproduced the structure proposed by Bem (1974) when we forced the extraction of two factors with the exception of the item “assertive,” which unexpectedly had higher scores in the femininity dimension (.58) than in the masculinity dimension (.14). We decided to exclude this item. Recent research did not find gender differences among some traits traditionally related to masculinity (Donnelly and Twenge 2017). However, unlike the original scale, we use these items to know how women would describe themselves after sexism confrontation. The instructions were: “After the situation described, to what extent do you think that the following characteristics would reflect your state?” The response format was from 1 (nothing) to 7 (very much). Mean scores for each subscale were calculated, with higher scores indicating higher level of agency or communality. The reliability coefficients were good both for communal characteristics (10 items, $\alpha=.88$) and agentic traits (11 items, $\alpha=.86$).

Other possible future responses to the sexist comment. In addition to assertive confrontation items, we included two items to assess aggressive verbal confrontation intentions (“I would insult him” and “I would shout at him”), two items to assess aggressive nonverbal confrontation intentions (“I would look at him with contempt” and “I would pull a disgusted face”), two items to assess denigratory confrontation (“I would respond sarcastically” and “I would try to use humor to put him down”), two items to assess avoidance responses (“I would ignore the situation” and “I would not say anything or do anything”). When we conducted the factorial analysis, the factors predicted emerged, with the exception of aggressive items (verbal and nonverbal) which were grouped in the same factor. Mean scores for each subscale were calculated, with higher scores indicating higher level of each response. The reliability

coefficients were acceptable for aggressive confrontation intentions ($\alpha=.76$) and for denigratory confrontation intentions ($\alpha=.69$) but not for avoidance responses ($\alpha=-1.92$).

Awareness of gender inequality. This was measured with four items used by Jost and Kay (2005) to measure gender-system justification and adapted to Spanish, as well as two items used by (Radke et al. 2018) to measure awareness of gender inequality. Negative items were reversed. The response format was from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). Mean score was calculated, with higher scores indicating higher level of awareness of gender inequality. The reliability coefficient was low ($\alpha=.57$) therefore we did not conduct result using this measure.

Results

Sadness, Anxiety and Women's Self-Descriptions as Communal

We conducted a set of univariate ANOVAs including type of confrontation (egalitarian vs. paternalistic) as independent variable. Univariate effect of condition emerged on: sadness $F(1, 196) = 14.88, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .071$; anxiety $F(1, 196) = 4.87, p = .029, \eta_p^2 = .024$; and women's self-descriptions as communal $F(1, 196) = 10.55, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .051$. No other significant effect of condition was found, $F_s < 0.17, p_s > .67$. Results showed that after paternalistic confrontation women experienced more sadness, more anxiety and they self-describe in a lower extent as being more communal than after egalitarian confrontation (see Table 2s, Panel A).

Women's Future Intention to Confront Assertively

We conducted a parallel mediational model including empowerment, anger, happiness, sadness and anxiety results as mediators. Neither total effect ($b = .07, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.39; .54], p = .739$) nor direct effect of type of confrontation on women's future intention to confront assertively were significant ($b = .15, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.34, .64], p = .547$). However, we found

significant indirect effects via empowerment ($b = .17$, 95% CI [.03, .40]) and anger ($b = -.52$, 95% CI [-.97, -.24]). No other indirect effects were significant. These results showed that the more empowerment that women experienced after egalitarian confrontation and the more anger they experienced after paternalistic confrontation led them to express greater future intention to confront.

Women's Future Intention to Confront Aggressively

We conducted the same parallel mediational model described in the paper (including empowerment, anger and happiness as mediators) but using as dependent variable the intention to confront in the future in an aggressive way. Again, neither the total effect ($b = -.06$, 95% CI [-.46, .34]), $p = .771$) nor the direct effect of condition on aggressive sexism confrontation were significant ($b = .04$, 95% CI [-.39, .48]), $p = .704$). But the indirect effect through anger was significant ($b = -.24$, 95% CI [-.51, -.03]), which means that egalitarian confrontation (compared to paternalistic confrontation) makes women feel angrier, which leads them to express greater intention to confront aggressively in the future. No other indirect effects were significant.

Studies 2 and 3

Measures

Here we include some extra measures that were included but that are not described in the main text.

Political orientation. This was measured with the same single item used in Study 1. (Study 2: $M = 3.01$, $SD = .84$; Study 3: $M = 3.71$, $SD = .87$).

Other emotions. Beyond happiness and hostility, we assessed the other subscales of the Escala de Valoración del Estado de Ánimo (EVEA) [Scale for Mood Assessment] (Sanz 2001).

Reliability coefficient was good both for anxiety (Study 2: $\alpha=.84$; Study 3: $\alpha=.86$) and sadness (Study 2: $\alpha=.80$; Study 3: $\alpha=.76$).

Self-perception of women in stereotypical and contra-stereotypical way. As in Study 1, this was measured through the adaption of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem 1974). In Study 2, we used the adaptation that Troche and Rammsayer (2011) used, while in Study 3 we used the same items as in Study 1. We conducted a factorial analysis forcing the extraction of two factors. This way the structure proposed by Bem (1974) was reproduced with the exception of the four items in Study 2 (“communicative,” “emotional,” “talkative,” “with business skills”) and one item in Study 3 (“aggressive”), which saturated more in the contrary dimension than expected,¹ which is why we decided to exclude these items. The reliability coefficients were good both for communal traits (Study 2: 13 items, $\alpha=.89$; Study 3: 11 items, $\alpha=.88$) and agentic traits (Study 2: 15 items, $\alpha=.93$; Study 3: 11 items, $\alpha=.91$).

Modern Sexism scale (Swim et al. 1995). This was included to control the possible differences in the level of sexism between Germany (Study 2) and Mexico (Study 3). According to the authors, the modern sexist beliefs are characterized by the denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward women’s demands, and lack of support for policies designed to help women (e.g., discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States).

The original scale was composed of eight items. In Study 2, we used the German validation

¹ “Communicative” saturated more in the masculinity (.65) than in the femininity dimension (.32); “emotional” saturated more in the masculinity (.40) than in the femininity dimension (.12); “talkative” saturated more in the masculinity (.50) than in the femininity dimension (.13); “with business skills” saturated more in the femininity (.42) than in the masculinity dimension (.30). These results confirm that, as recent research highlights, gender stereotypes are complex and to a certain extent are changing (Donnelly & Twenge, 2017; Henstschel, Heilman & Peus, 2019).

conducted by Eckes and Six-Materna (1998), composed of 10 items. In Study 3 we translated these items into Spanish because no validation was available. Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Once corresponding items were reversed, responses to all items were averaged to create a composite score in which higher scores indicate greater modern sexism. The reliability coefficients were good for Study 2 ($\alpha = .85$) but low for Study 3 ($\alpha = .53$).

Results

Sadness, Anxiety and Women's Self-Descriptions as Agentic and Communal

We conducted a set of univariate ANOVAs including type of confrontation (target vs. egalitarian men vs. paternalistic men) as independent variable.

In Study 2, a univariate effect of type of confrontation emerged on: sadness $F(2, 218) = 3.31, p = .038, \eta_p^2 = .029$; anxiety $F(2, 218) = 18.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .144$; and women's self-descriptions as agentic $F(2, 218) = 16.94, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .135$ and communal $F(2, 218) = 5.15, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .045$. Results showed that after target confrontation women reported more anxiety and they self-described to a greater extent as agentic and to a lesser extent as communal compared to after men's paternalistic and men's egalitarian confrontation. There were no significant differences between men egalitarian and paternalistic confrontation in these variables. In addition, after target confrontation they reported feeling as sad as after men paternalistic confrontation but sadder than after men egalitarian confrontation (see Table 2s, Panel B).

In Study 3, a univariate effect of condition emerged on sadness $F(2, 168) = 8.70, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .094$; and anxiety $F(2, 168) = 17.48, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .172$; and women's self-descriptions as agentic $F(2, 168) = 18.51, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .181$ and communal $F(2, 168) = 16.16, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .129$. Results showed that after men egalitarian confrontation women reported less

sadness and they self-describe to a greater extent as communal compared to after target and men paternalistic confrontation. There were no significant differences between target and paternalistic confrontation in these variables. In addition, after target confrontation women reported feeling more anxious and self-described as more agentic than after men paternalistic confrontation, and in turn, after men paternalistic confrontation women reported feeling more anxious and self-described as more agentic than after men egalitarian confrontation (see Table 2s, Panel C).

Women's Future Intention to Confront Assertively

We conducted a parallel mediational model including empowerment, anger, happiness, sadness and anxiety results as mediators.

In Study 2, on the one hand, the total effect of Contrast 1 (men's egalitarian vs. men's paternalistic confrontation) was significant ($b = -.47$, 95% CI $[-.88, -.06]$, $p = .024$), as well as the indirect effect via anger ($b = -.43$, 95% CI $[-.77, -.19]$) and anxiety ($b = .15$, 95% CI $[.03, .34]$). Direct effect became nonsignificant when the mediators were included ($b = -.38$, 95% CI $[-.80, .03]$, $p = .072$). No other indirect effects were significant. On the other hand, neither total effect of Contrast 2 (target vs. men's confrontation) ($b = .12$, 95% CI $[-.11, .35]$, $p = .323$) nor direct effect of condition on confrontation was significant ($b = -.03$, 95% CI $[-.38, .32]$, $p = .867$). However, we found significant indirect effects via anger ($b = .42$, 95% CI $[.23, .63]$) and anxiety ($b = -.22$, 95% CI $[-.38; -.10]$). No other indirect effects were significant. These results showed that the more anger that women experienced, both after paternalistic and after target confrontation, led them to express greater future intention to confront, whereas the more anxiety they experienced both after paternalistic and after target confrontation inhibited future intention to confront.

In Study 3, on the one hand, neither total effect of Contrast 1 (men's egalitarian vs. men's paternalistic confrontation) ($b = -.11$, 95% CI $[-.35, .13]$, $p = .353$) nor direct effect of condition on confrontation were significant ($b = -.17$, 95% CI $[-.42, .09]$, $p = .194$). However, we found significant indirect effects via empowerment ($b = .10$, 95% CI $[.02, .24]$). No other significant effects were found. These results showed that the greater empowerment that women experienced after egalitarian confrontation led them to express stronger future intention to confront.

Table 1s. *Factor analysis of principal components analysis of emotions*

	Factor 1 (anger)	Factor 2 (happiness)	Factor 3 (sadness and anxiety)	Factor 4 (other items)
Ofendida [Offended]	.80	-.37		
Insultada [Insulted]	.80	-.36		
Indignada [Outraged]	.78	-.37		
Humillada [Humiliated]	.75			
Con rabia [With Rage]	.74			
Molesta [Annoyed]	.74	-.36	.32	
Enojada [Displeased]	.73		.45	
Engadada [Angry]	.71	-.36	.40	
Irritada [Irritated]	.71		.46	
Optimista [Optimistic]		.77		
Alegre [Happy]		.76		.31
Contenta [Joyful]		.76		.34
Agradecida [Grateful]		.76		
Respetada [Respected]	-.41	.72		
Cómoda [Comfortable]	-.41	.71		
Relajada [Relaxed]	-.43	.55		
Apagada [Downcast]			.75	
Nerviosa [Nervous]	.30		.71	
Ansiosa [Anxious]			.70	
Intranquila [Restless]	.40		.68	
Deprimida [Depressed]			.67	
Triste [Sad]			.65	
Tensa [Tense]	.52		.62	
Jovial ^a [Cheerful]		.35		.66
Melancólica ^a [Melancholy]			.40	.61
Percentage of variance accounted for	45.46	13.46	5.11	4.80

Factor loadings above .30 are reported.

^a Note that the two last items load in the last factor despite also loading above .30 in other factors. According to the original validated scale (Sanz, 2001) we decided to maintain Jovial [Cheerful] in the second factor (happiness) and Melancólica [Melancholy] in the third factor (which combines sadness and anxiety items).

Table 2 Appendix.

Main effect of type of confrontation on dependent variables. Means and Standard Deviations

Study 1 (Spain)									
Experimental condition	<i>n</i>	Sadness <i>M (SE)</i>	Anxiety <i>M (SE)</i>	Agency <i>M (SE)</i>	Communality <i>M (SE)</i>	Aggressive confrontation <i>M (SE)</i>	Denigratory confrontation <i>M (SE)</i>	Body response <i>M (SE)</i>	Awareness GI <i>M (SE)</i>
Male egalitarian confrontation	100	1.64a (.19)	3.75a (.25)	4.24a (.11)	3.11a (.12)	4.49a (.14)	5.49a (.16)	3.84a (.19)	5.83a (.08)
Male paternalistic confrontation	98	2.67b (.19)	4.53b (.25)	4.27a (.11)	2.56b (.12)	4.55a (.14)	5.58a (.16)	3.73a (.19)	5.80a (.08)
<i>F</i>		14.88***	4.87*	0.05 ns	10.55**	0.08 ns	0.17 ns	.15 ns	.10 ns
Study 2 (Germany)									
	<i>n</i>	Sadness <i>M (SE)</i>	Anxiety <i>M (SE)</i>	Agency <i>M (SE)</i>	Communality <i>M (SE)</i>				
Male egalitarian confrontation	75	1.99a (.23)	3.27a (.25)	3.70a (.14)	2.80a (.12)				
Male paternalistic confrontation	68	2.58ab (.24)	4.03a (.26)	3.51a (.14)	2.78a (.12)				
Target confrontation	78	2.78b (.22)	5.37b (.25)	4.56b (.13)	2.33b (.12)				
<i>F</i>		3.31*	18.37***	16.94***	5.15**				
Study 3 (Mexico)									
	<i>n</i>	Sadness <i>M (SE)</i>	Anxiety <i>M (SE)</i>	Agency <i>M (SE)</i>	Communality <i>M (SE)</i>				
Male egalitarian confrontation	55	1.46a (1.53)	3.24a (2.41)	4.00a (1.32)	3.38a (1.24)				
Male paternalistic confrontation	59	2.82b (2.16)	4.84b (2.68)	3.31b (1.36)	2.60b (1.13)				
Target confrontation	57	2.78b (2.13)	6.01c (2.36)	4.74c (1.10)	2.34b (1.04)				
<i>F</i>		8.70***	17.48***	18.51***	12.46***				

Note: Different letter subscripts in a column within each panel denote significant differences in post hoc (Sidak) analyses at * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. All discrepancies between sample sizes in the participants' section and in the table are due to missing values

References Supplementary Materials

- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155–162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036215>
- Bosak, J., Szczesny, S., & Eagly, A. (2008). Communion and agency judgments of women and men as a function of role information and response format. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 1148–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.538>
- Colley, A., Mulhern, G., Maltby, J., & Wood, A.M. (2009). The short form BSRI: Instrumentality, expressiveness and gender associations among a United Kingdom sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 384–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.005>
- Donnelly, K., & Twenge, J. (2017). Masculine and feminine traits on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, 1993–2012: A cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, 76, 556–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0625-y>
- Eckes, T., & Six-Materna, I. (1998). Leugnung von Diskriminierung: Eine Skala zur Erfassung des modernen Sexismus [Denial of discrimination: A scale measuring modern sexism]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 29(3), 224–238.
- Hentschel, T. (2019). The multiple dimensions of gender stereotypes: A current look at men's and women's characterizations of others and themselves. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00011>
- Swim, J.K., Aikin, K.J., Hall, W.S., & Hunter, B.A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2):199–214. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199>

Troche, S.J., & Thomas H. R. (2011). Eine Revision des deutschsprachigen Bem Sex- Role Inventory. *Klinische Diagnostik und Evaluation*, 4, 262–283.

SUPPLEMENT 2: ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE MAIN MEASURES, AND
ORIGINAL QUESTIONNAIRES IN SPANISH AND GERMAN

Main Measures Included in Studies 1–3 (translations to English)

Gender and Feminist Identification

Response Scale= 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree)

1. To what extent do you identify with people identified with your gender/feminist people?
2. To what extent do you feel a bond with people identified with your gender/ feminist people?

Political Orientation

Response Scale= 1 (Extreme left) to 7 (Extreme right)

1. How would you define your political orientation?

Benevolent Sexism

Here there are some sentences about men and women and the relationship between them in our current society. Please express your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

Response Scale= 0 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)

1. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess
2. Women should be cherished and protected by men
3. Every man ought to have a woman to love
4. Men are incomplete without women
5. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility
6. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives

Type of Confrontation

Next you will see a comic where a social interaction is represented. Please pay attention to the text, trying to put yourself in Marisa's place. Make sure you understand what is happening.

Egalitarian confrontation condition (Studies 1–3)

Marisa is partying with her friends in a pub. At a certain moment she decides to go outside to smoke. When she is on the street she realizes that she has forgotten the lighter, so she approaches a group of people who are at the door of the pub, and this is what happens...




Paternalistic confrontation condition (Studies 1–3)

Marisa is partying with her friends in a pub. At a certain moment she decides to go outside to smoke. When she is on the street she realizes that she has forgotten the lighter so she approaches a group of people who are at the door of the pub, and this is what happens...




Target confrontation condition (Only Studies 2 and 3)

Marisa is partying with her friends in a pub. At a certain moment she decides go outside to smoke. When she is on the street she realizes that she has forgotten the lighter so she approaches a group of people who are at the door of the pub, and this is what happens...



Empowerment and Emotions



Male egalitarian confrontation



Male paternalistic confrontation




Target confrontation

If you were Marisa, how would you feel after the comment by the guy in the black shirt/ you react to the guy in the white shirt?

Response Scale= 0 (Nothing) to 10 (Very much)

1. Respected
2. Without control of the situation
3. Powerful
4. Full of energy
5. Comfortable
6. Weak
7. Empowered
8. With rage
9. Relaxed
10. Inferior
11. Defenseless
12. Stimulated
13. Outraged
14. Offended
15. Grateful
16. Insulted
17. Humiliated
18. Nervous
19. Irritated
20. Cheerful
21. Melancholy
22. Tense
23. Optimistic
24. Downcast
25. Angry
26. Anxious
27. Depressed
28. Annoyed
29. Joyful
30. Restless
31. Displeased
32. Happy
33. Sad

Women's Future Intention to Confront



If in the future you experience a comment like the guy in the white t-shirt made, what do you think you would do... ?

Response Scale= 1 (Sure I would do it) to 7 (Sure I would not do it)

1. I would try to make the guy see that his attitude is offensive
2. I would try to explain to the guy that his comment bothered me
3. I would let him know that I don't think it's right to have such attitudes towards women
4. I would tell him he has no right to treat women like this

Manipulation Check

Finally, we ask you to remember the social interaction represented in the comic. What happened?

Mark the answer that best describes the situation

- A guy said he would lend Marisa his lighter if in return she went to sleep with him. She answered that the comment was sexist and that men should fight against gender inequality
- A guy said he would lend Marisa his lighter if in return she went to sleep with him. Another guy replied that the comment was sexist and that men should fight against gender inequality
- A guy said he would lend Marisa his lighter if in return she went to sleep with him. Another guy replied that the comment was inappropriate and that men should care for and protect women
- I do not remember

All Measures Included in Studies 1–3 (original languages)

- Materials used in Study 1 and 3 are written in Spanish (small adaptations of Spanish from Spain to Spanish from Mexico appear in brackets)
- Materials used in Study 2 are written in German
- Differences among studies are indicated.

Gender Identity

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Response Scale = 1 (Nada) to 7 (Mucho)

1. ¿En qué medida te identificas con las personas de tu mismo género/feministas?
2. ¿En qué medida sientes un vínculo con las personas de tu mismo género/feministas?

Study 2 (Germany)

Response Scale = 1 (Gar nicht) to 7 (Sehr)

1. Inwieweit identifizierst du dich mit deinem Geschlecht/ dich als feministisch?
2. Inwieweit fühlst du dich mit anderen Mitgliedern deines Geschlechts verbunden/
FeministInnen verbunden?

Political Orientation

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Response Scale = 1 (Extrema Izquierda) to 7 (Extrema Derecha)

2. ¿Cómo definirías tu orientación política?

Study 2 (Germany)

Response Scale = 1 (Extreme links) to 7 (Extreme rechts)

1. Wie würdest du deine politische Orientierung definieren?

Benevolent Sexism

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Response Scale = 0 (Totalmente en desacuerdo) to 5 (Totalmente de acuerdo)

A continuación te presentamos una serie de frases sobre los hombres y las mujeres y sobre la relación entre ellos en nuestra sociedad actual. Por favor expresa tu acuerdo o desacuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones. El número “0” significa “totalmente en desacuerdo” y el número 5 “totalmente de acuerdo”. Marca con una “X” en el número que mejor se ajusta a tu acuerdo o desacuerdo en cada caso.

1. Muchas mujeres se caracterizan por una pureza que pocos hombres poseen
2. Las mujeres deben ser queridas y protegidas por los hombres

3. Todo hombre debe tener a una mujer a quien amar
4. El hombre está incompleto sin la mujer
5. Las mujeres, en comparación con los hombres, tienden a tener una mayor sensibilidad moral
6. Los hombres deberían estar dispuestos a sacrificar su propio bienestar con el fin de proveer seguridad económica a las mujeres

Study 2 (Germany)

Response Scale = 1 (Stimme überhaupt nicht zu) to 7 (Stimme voll und ganz zu)

Als nächstes stellen wir dir einige Aussagen über Männer und Frauen und über die Beziehung zwischen ihnen in unserer heutigen Gesellschaft vor. Bitte bringe deine Zustimmung oder Ablehnung darüber zum Ausdruck. Die Zahl "0" bedeutet "stimme überhaupt nicht zu" und die Zahl 5 "stimme voll und ganz zu". Markiere die Zahl mit einem "X", die deiner Zustimmung oder Ablehnung über jede der Aussagen am besten entspricht.

1. Viele Frauen haben eine Art Ehrlichkeit, die nur wenige Männer besitzen
2. Frauen sollten von Männern umsorgt und geschützt werden
3. Jeder Mann sollte eine Frau haben, die er wirklich liebt
4. Männer sind ohne Frauen unvollkommen
5. Verglichen mit Männern haben Frauen ein besseres moralisches Empfinden
6. Ein Mann sollte bereit sein, sein eigenes Wohl zu opfern, um für seine Frau sorgen zu können

Type of Confrontation

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

A continuación, verás unas viñetas donde se representa una interacción social. Por favor, presta atención al texto intentando ponerte en el lugar de Marisa. Asegúrate de entender lo que ocurre.

Study 2 (Germany)

Unten siehst du einige Vignetten, auf denen eine soziale Interaktion dargestellt ist. Bitte richte deine Aufmerksamkeit auf den Text und versuche dir dabei vorzustellen, in Marissa's Position zu sein. Vergewissere dich, dass du verstehst, was passiert.

Egalitarian Confrontation Condition (Studies 1–3)

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)



Study 2 (Germany)



Paternalistic Confrontation Condition (Studies 1–3)

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Marisa está de fiesta con sus amigos y amigas en un pub (antro). En un momento dado decide salir a fumar. Cuando está en la calle se da cuenta de que ha olvidado el mechero así que se acerca a un grupo de gente que está en la puerta del pub, y esto es lo que ocurre...

Chicos, ¿podéis prestarme un mechero (encendedor)?

Claro que te lo presto, guapa. Pero si a cambio te vienes a dormir conmigo esta noche que no quiero dormir solo

¡Eh! ¿Que te pasa?. Ese comentario es grosero. No creo que sea apropiado tratar a las mujeres así. Los hombres deberíamos cuidar y proteger a las mujeres

Study 2 (Germany)

Marissa feiert mit ihren Freundinnen und Freunden eine Party in einer Bar. In einem Moment beschließt sie, nach draußen zu gehen, um zu rauchen. Als sie auf der Straße ist, bemerkt sie, dass sie ihr Feuerzeug vergessen hat. Also nähert sie sich einer Gruppe von Leuten, die in der Kneipentür stehen, und das ist was passiert...

Leute, könnt ihr mir ein Feuerzeug leihen?

Natürlich kann ich dir eins leihen, Hübsche. Aber im Austausch dafür musst du heute Nacht bei mir schlafen, weil ich nicht alleine schlafen möchte!

Hey! Was ist los mit dir? Dein Kommentar ist unhöflich. Es ist nicht angemessen, Frauen so zu behandeln. Männer sollten sich um Frauen kümmern und sie beschützen!

Target Confrontation Condition (Studies 2 & 3)

Study 2 (Germany)




Study 3 (Mexico)




When we asked participants to answer the main dependent variables we included again the picture of the confronter. We did this to be sure that the ratings they gave to empowerment, emotions and future intention to confront were linked to the confronter's behavior. The image presented was consistent with the experimental condition that each participant had read previously.

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)




Study 2 (Germany)



Empowerment and Emotions

Study 1 (Spain)



Imagínate que tú eres Marisa. Rodea la imagen que creas que mejor representaría tu posición corporal tras escuchar la respuesta del chico de la camiseta negra al comentario del chico de la camiseta blanca

We found no significant effects of type of confrontation on the pictorial measure, so we did not include it in either Study 2 or in Study 3.

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Men confrontation conditions: Tras escuchar la respuesta del chico de la camiseta negra al comentario del chico de la camiseta blanca, ¿cómo te sentirías?

Target confrontation condition: Si tú fueras Marisa, ¿cómo te sentirías después de responder al chico de la camiseta blanca?

Response Scale = 0 (Nada) to 10 (Mucho)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Respetada | 18. Nerviosa |
| 2. Sin el control de la situación | 19. Irritada |
| 3. Poderosa | 20. Alegre |
| 4. Llena de energía | 21. Melancólica |
| 5. Cómoda | 22. Tensa |
| 6. Débil | 23. Optimista |
| 7. Empoderada | 24. Alicaída (desanimada) |
| 8. Con rabia | 25. Enojada |
| 9. Relajada | 26. Ansiosa |
| 10. Inferior | 27. Apagada |
| 11. Indefensa | 28. Molesta |
| 12. Estimulada (activada) | 29. Jovial |
| 13. Indignada | 30. Intranquila |
| 14. Ofendida | 31. Enfadada |
| 15. Agradecida | 32. Contenta |
| 16. Insultada | 33. Triste |
| 17. Humillada | |

Study 2 (Germany)

Men confrontation conditions: Wie würdest du dich an Marissas Stelle fühlen nachdem du gehört hättest, was der Mann im roten T-shirt dem Mann im grünen T-shirt antwortet?

Target confrontation condition: Wie würdest du dich an Marissas Stelle fühlen nachdem du dem Mann im grünen T-shirt auf diese Weise geantwortet hättest?

Response Scale = 0 (Gar nicht) to 10 (Sehr)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Respektiert | 17. Nervös |
| 2. Ohne Kontrolle über die Situation | 18. Irritiert |
| 3. Stark | 19. Fröhlich |
| 4. Voller Energie | 20. Melancholisch |
| 5. Wohl fühlend | 21. Angespannt |
| 6. Schwach | 22. Optimistisch |
| 7. Empowered (gestärkt) | 23. Niedergeschlagen |
| 8. Wütend | 24. Wütend |
| 9. Entspannt | 25. Ängstlich |
| 10. Unterlegen | 26. Deprimiert |
| 11. Wehrlos | 27. Verärgert |
| 12. Angeregt | 28. Erfreut |
| 13. Aufgebracht | 29. Rastlos |
| 14. Angegriffen | 30. Unzufrieden |
| 15. Dankbar (grateful) | 31. Glücklich |
| 16. Gedeemütigt | 32. Traurig |

Self-Descriptions as Agentic and Communal

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Men confrontation conditions: De nuevo te pedimos que te imagines en la misma situación: después de que el chico de la camiseta negra responda al otro chico. Justo en ese momento, ¿en qué medida las características que se recogen en los siguientes ítems crees que reflejarían tu estado?

Target confrontation condition: De nuevo te pedimos que te imagines en la misma situación: después de que respondas al chico de la camiseta blanca de esta manera. Justo en ese momento, ¿en qué medida las características que se recogen en los siguientes ítems crees que reflejarían tu estado?

Response Scale = 1 (Nada) to 7 (Mucho)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Afectuosa | 4. Capaz de tomar decisiones con facilidad |
| 2. Dominante | 5. Simpática |
| 3. Defensora de la opinión propia | 6. Cálida |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 3. Independiente | 11. Con fuerte personalidad |
| 4. Tierna | 12. Amante de los/as niños/as |
| 5. Sensible a las necesidades de los demás | 13. Compasiva |
| 6. Con habilidades de liderazgo | 14. Agresiva |
| 7. Asertiva | 15. Fuerte |
| 8. Amable | 16. Competitiva |
| 9. Comprensiva | 17. Preocupada por consolar a los demás |
| 10. Atrevida | 18. Dispuesta a posicionarse |

Study 2 (Germany)

Men confrontation conditions: Wir möchten dich darum bitten, dass du dich dir erneut in der gleichen Situation vorstellst: nachdem der Mann im rotem T-shirt dem Mann im grünen antwortet. In welchem Ausmaß stimmen die folgenden Eigenschaften mit deinem Zustand in genau diesem Moment überein?

Target confrontation condition: Wir möchten dich darum bitten, dass du dich dir erneut in der gleichen Situation vorstellst: nachdem du dem Mann im grünen T-shirt auf diese Weise antwortest. In welchem Ausmaß stimmen die folgenden Eigenschaften mit deinem Zustand in genau diesem Moment überein?

Response Scale = 1 (Gar nicht) to 7 (Sehr)

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. Hat Führungseigenschaften | 16. Entscheidungsfreudig |
| 2. Modebewusst | 17. Hartnäckig |
| 3. Weichherzig | 18. Zärtlich |
| 4. Zeigt geschäftsmäßiges Verhalten | 19. Empfindsam |
| 5. Tritt bestimmt auf | 20. Mächtig |
| 6. Fürsorglich | 21. Ist bereit, etwas zu riskieren |
| 7. Bemüht sich, verletzte Gefühle zu besänftigen | 22. Sensibel |
| 8. Logisch | 23. Herzlich |
| 9. Respekteinflößend | 24. Dominant |
| 10. Mitteilungsbedürftig | 25. Kraftvoll |
| 11. Feinfühlig | 26. Kommunikativ |
| 12. Selbstsicher | 27. Anmutig |
| 13. Verteidigt die eigene Meinung | 28. Erfolgsorientiert |
| 14. An anderen Menschen interessiert | 29. Furchtlos |
| 15. Sinnlich | 30. Emotional |

Women's Future Intentions to Confront

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico)

Si en el futuro experimentas algún comentario como el que hace el chico de la camiseta blanca, ¿qué crees que harías...?

Response Scale = 1 (Seguro que NO) to 7 (Seguro que SÍ)

1. Le insultaría²
2. Le gritaría¹
3. Le respondería sarcásticamente¹
4. Intentaría usar el humor para dejarle en evidencia¹
5. Lo miraría con desprecio¹
6. Pondría cara de asco¹
7. Ignoraría la situación¹
8. No diría ni haría nada¹
9. Le haría saber que no me parece correcto que se tengan ese tipo de actitudes hacia las mujeres
10. Le diría que no tiene derecho a tratar a las mujeres así
11. Trataría de hacerle ver que su actitud es ofensiva³
12. Le explicaría que su comentario me ha molestado²

Study 2 (Germany)

Was denkst du würdest du tun, wenn du in der Zukunft einen Kommentar wie der des Mannes im grünen T-shirt hören würdest...?

Response Scale = 1 (Überhaupt nicht wahrscheinlich) to 7 (Sehr wahrscheinlich)

1. Ich würde versuchen dem Mann klarzumachen, dass seine Einstellung abstoßend ist
2. Ich würde versuchen, dem Mann zu erklären, dass sein Kommentar mich gestört hat
3. Ich würde ihn wissen lassen, dass ich es für nicht richtig halte, diese Art von Einstellung gegenüber Frauen zu haben
4. Ich würde ihm sagen, dass er kein Recht hat, Frauen so zu behandeln

Modern Sexism

This measure was not included in Study 1.

² Items 1–8 only were included in Study 1 but not in Study 3.

³ Items 11 and 12 only were included in Study 3 but not in Study 1.

Study 2 (Germany)

Bitte beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen bzw. bewerten Sie die folgenden Aussagen.

Response Scale = 1 (Stimme überhaupt nicht zu) to 7 (Stimme voll und ganz zu)

1. Diskriminierung von Frauen ist in Deutschland immer noch ein Problem
2. Frauen und Männer haben in der heutigen Gesellschaft die gleichen Chancen, etwas zu erreichen
3. Die Forderungen von Frauen nach Gleichberechtigung sind leicht nachzuvollziehen
4. Wenn Frauen tatsächlich einmal schlechter bezahlt werden als Männer, dann nur deshalb, weil sie einfachere Arbeit zu leisten haben
5. Im Fernsehen gibt es häufig frauenfeindliche Darstellungen
6. Im Allgemeinen werden in unserer Gesellschaft Ehepartner gleichbehandelt
7. In der Schule werden Mädchen immer noch benachteiligt
8. Heutzutage werden Frauen im Berufsleben fair behandelt
9. In den westlichen Ländern ist Gleichberechtigung von Frauen schon lange verwirklicht
10. Frauen finden häufig keine gutbezahlte Arbeit, weil sie diskriminiert werden

Study 3 (Mexico)

Por favor, responde a las siguientes frases según tu opinión:

Response Scale = 1 (Totalmente en desacuerdo) to 7 (Totalmente de acuerdo)

1. La discriminación contra las mujeres ya no es un problema en México
2. Las mujeres dejan escapar buenos trabajos por estar demasiado preocupadas por la discriminación sexual
3. Es raro ver a mujeres tratadas de manera sexista en televisión
4. En general, las personas en nuestra sociedad tratan a maridos y mujeres por igual
5. La sociedad ha alcanzado un punto en el que hombres y mujeres tienen las mismas oportunidades
6. Es fácil de entender el enfado de los grupos de mujeres en México.
7. Es fácil de entender que los grupos de mujeres todavía estén preocupados por las limitadas oportunidades de las mujeres en la sociedad
8. En los últimos años, el gobierno y los medios de comunicación se han preocupado por el trato a las mujeres más de lo que realmente está justificado

Manipulation Check (1)

Study 1 (Spain). *The following questions were not included in either Study 2 (Germany) or in Study 3 (Mexico).*

A continuación, te pedimos que respondas algunas preguntas en relación a los dos chicos que participan en la interacción que aparece representada en las viñetas

Escala de Respuesta = De -3 (Nada sexista/negativo) a +3 (Muy sexista/negativo)

1. ¿En qué medida consideras el comentario del chico de la camiseta blanca es...?

2. ¿En qué medida consideras el comentario del chico de la camiseta negra es...?

Awareness of Gender Inequality

Study 1 (Spain). *The following questions were not included in either Study 2 (Germany) or in Study 3 (Mexico).*

¿En qué medida estás de acuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones?

Response Scale = 1 (Totalmente en desacuerdo) to 7 (Totalmente de acuerdo)

1. En general, las relaciones entre hombres y mujeres son justas
2. Necesitamos luchar para conseguir mayor igualdad de género
3. Los roles de género necesitan ser radicalmente reestructurados
4. En nuestra sociedad hombres y mujeres ya tienen las mismas oportunidades
5. El sexismo en la sociedad empeora cada año
6. La igualdad de género ya ha sido alcanzada

Manipulation Check (2)

Study 1 (Spain) & Study 3 (Mexico). *This measure was not included in Study 2 (Germany).*

En qué medida crees que el chico de la camiseta negra es/está...

Response Scale = 1 (Totalmente en desacuerdo) to 7 (Totalmente de acuerdo)

1. Rechazando el sexismo
2. A favor de la igualdad
3. Comportándose con caballerosidad
4. Igualitario
5. Empoderando a la mujer
6. Defendiendo unos roles de género tradicionales
7. Un caballero
8. Luchando contra la desigualdad de género
9. Paternalista
10. Feminista
11. Defendiendo unos roles de género progresistas
12. Protegiendo a las mujeres

Study 2 (Germany)

Zum Schluss möchten wir dich bitten dich an die in den Vignetten dargestellte soziale Interaktion zu erinnern. Was ist dort passiert? Markiere die Antwort, die die Situation am besten beschreibt.

1. Ein Mann war bereit, Marissa ein Feuerzeug zu leihen, allerdings nur unter der Bedingung, dass sie dafür bei ihm schlafen würde. Sie antwortete, dass der Kommentar sexistisch sei und dass Männer sich gegen die Ungleichheit zwischen Geschlechtern einsetzen sollten.
2. Ein Mann war bereit, Marissa ein Feuerzeug zu leihen, allerdings nur unter der Bedingung, dass sie dafür bei ihm schlafen würde. Ein anderer Mann antwortete, dass der Kommentar sexistisch sei und dass Männer sich gegen die Ungleichheit zwischen Geschlechtern einsetzen sollten.
3. Ein Mann war bereit, Marissa ein Feuerzeug zu leihen, allerdings nur unter der Bedingung, dass sie dafür bei ihm schlafen würde. Ein anderer Mann antwortete, dass der Kommentar unhöflich sei und dass Männer sich um Frauen kümmern und sie beschützen sollten
4. Ich erinnere mich nicht

Study 3 (Mexico)

Para terminar, te pedimos que recuerdes la interacción social representada en las viñetas, ¿qué ocurrió en ellas? Marca la respuesta que mejor describa la situación

1. Un chico dijo que él le prestaría a Marisa su encendedor si a cambio ella se iba a dormir con él. Ella respondió que el comentario era sexista y que los hombres deberían luchar contra la desigualdad de género
2. Un chico dijo que él le prestaría a Marisa su encendedor si a cambio ella se iba a dormir con él. Otro chico respondió que el comentario era sexista y que los hombres deberían luchar contra la desigualdad de género
3. Un chico dijo que él le prestaría a Marisa su encendedor si a cambio ella se iba a dormir con él. Otro chico respondió que el comentario era inadecuado y que los hombres deberían cuidar y proteger a las mujeres
4. No lo recuerdo